

THE

"EXTINGUISHER" EXTINGUISHED!

OR

DAVID M. REESE, M. D.

"USED UP."

BY DAVID RUGGLES,

A Man of Color.

TOGETHER WITH SOME REMARKS UPON A LATE PRODUCTION, ENTITLED

"AN ADDRESS ON SLAVERY AND AGAINST IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION  
WITH A PLAN OF THEIR BEING GRADUALLY EMANCIPATED  
AND COLONIZED IN THIRTY-TWO YEARS.

BY HEMAN HOWLETT."

---

New-York :

PUBLISHED AND SOLD BY D. RUGGLES, BOOKSELLER,  
65 Lispenard Street, near Broadway.

MDCCCLXXXIV.

# PREFACE.

---

IN criticising DR. REESE'S production of doubtful fame—in showing his absurdities and exposing his sophistry—in alluding to that great PLAN of H. Howlett, and in noticing the course of his vast conceptions, I hope that I may not be considered as intruding myself upon the public. I have waited for abler pens to accomplish the work, until I am persuaded that abler pens will have nothing to do with it. This is as might be expected, and is treating the profound authors as they deserve, viz: *with merited contempt*. But as the aforesaid pamphlets circulate among many who may be led away by their gloss and sophistry, I deem it a duty devolving upon *me*, as one upon whom their baneful effects operate, to counteract them, as Dr. Reese says, "by accompanying the antidote with the poison." I have inquired several times of my friends if some one was not coming out to answer Dr. R's "Extinguisher"—but they have said to me, distinguished writers and men of eminence will not stop their pursuits to notice such a production; it would be out of time and out of place: great minds and great heads will not have any thing to do with the trifling production of insignificant men. But Dr. Reese's "Extinguisher" may do mischief by its pestiferous effect upon the minds of the ignorant and uninformed, and it ought to be answered; and therefore it must be answered. And so I set about it\* I shall endeavour to be as concise as possible. Instead of making long quotations, I will merely refer to the page, stating the sentiment and remarking upon it. The two productions will be considered together, as they may serve to illustrate each other, and make their mutual errors mutually apparent. Dr. Reese's production is in the main a tissue of "hyperbole and cant." He appears to have

\* After the following sheets were prepared for the press, an answer to Dr. Reese's "Review" made its appearance. Although the author, "M. Mar Quack, M. D." 'dissected' the Dr. completely, and analyzed him, and I suppose got him ready for a *preparation*. Although he has said perhaps almost all that need be said to the putting down eternally of the D's book, yet he not being so well known in this city as myself, I deem it expedient that my name should go out to furnish a ground of responsibility against any charge that may be made. Martin Mar Quack is in Boston, but if the Doctor cringes at any thing I may say, here is David Ruggles on the spot, ready for an explanation and able to give satisfaction.

in the attitude in which the ancients painted Envy, viz. chewing a  
d toad and the gall running over his jaws.

Howlett's production is eminently superior, *taking one thing with another*.  
free from the offensive and frequent repetition of harsh sounding and  
many epithets, which so much to his hurt, characterizes the Dr. It is  
e, that his whole work looks very much like a hoax, and in fact had he  
not called upon me personally with his admirable production, and declared  
himself to be the distinguished author, and that his "*plan in all probability*  
*will (MOST LIKELY) go into operation,*" with a desire that IT MIGHT BE NO-  
TICED, I should have believed it to have been a hoax, and therefore it would  
have passed unnoticed. But the reader can rely upon Heman's being the  
veritable author of the book. And I might declare, as far as my authority can  
go, that Heman Howlett, "on gradual emancipation and colonization in thir-  
ty years," is the best thing that has ever been sent forth. There is no mis-  
take in it. He talks demonstration talk; and shows how the thing can be  
done.

In submitting this work to the public, I must beg the same indulgence in  
part, that H. Howlett craved for himself. I don't profess to be a great scholar.  
It is true I have been blessed with the advantages of a New England Free  
School education; and have read a little, and thought a little, and felt a little;  
and understand something about the subject of Slavery and Colonization. My  
zeal is to promote the welfare of my brethren in bonds; that urges me on to  
this work. Believing the cause of *immediate and universal emancipation* to  
be the cause of truth, and of God, I trust I shall not be discouraged, but be  
enabled to discharge the task with some degree of satisfaction both to *myself*  
and *my friends*.

D. R.

THE  
EXTINGUISHER EXTINGUISHED;  
OR  
DAVID M. REESE, M. D.

“USED UP.”

---

It is now more than two months since Doctor Reese's famous “*Extinguisher*” made its appearance in the world: expectation was on tiptoe, the mountain laboured, and a RIDICULUS MUS was brought forth.

This may be called a singular manner of commencing a criticism, but it will be considered proper by all those who have paid attention to the boasting, vamping, foaming style of the Doctor and his book. As if to secure for himself an admission of statements and erroneous reasonings, he raises an *alarm* in his preface, and with wondrous care *cautions* his fellow-citizens against the influence of the Anti-Slavery Society, and affectionately and earnestly admonishes Christians, that “the public mind *is not* and *cannot* be prepared to listen to the doctrines they advocate.” In proof of this he cites some passages of Scripture. Now, I am no preacher, nor have I ever studied Logic; but I have a few grains of sense sufficient to perceive when a text of Scripture is wrested from its meaning and perverted. To prove that abolitionists are suffering “persecution,” not in a “righteous” but an unrighteous, he attempts to prove that “persecution” must not be borne in any cause. [See pages 4 and 5 of his Preface.] “When ye are persecuted in one city flee to another,” &c. *This text*, believe it citizens of New-York, is adduced by a minister of the gospel, to show that we (as the drift certainly is) must always flee from persecution. “The public mind *is not* and *cannot* be prepared to listen to the doctrines they advocate, whatever evidence they think they have of their own patriotism, philanthropy and christianity.” How very modest! What blushing honors must crown the man,

can think so deservingly of a class of his fellow-citizens ! Nor can they hope to find any permanent solace in the self-complacency which accompanies the innocent under unrighteous persecution." How retiring ! The Doctor breathes nothing but charity ! "If they are christians," &c. Well, suppose they are christians, what then ? Why they must learn from the examples and precepts of our Saviour not to endure persecution, but to flee it. Dr. R. being the Commentator. "Let it not be supposed that in this reasoning with these mistaken and misguided men," &c. Dr. R. assumes the position not exactly "we are the men, and wisdom shall die with us," but I am the man, or something more, therefore wo to every "misguided, fanatical abolitionist" that falls beneath my censure and reprobation." "Justly merited by the attitude he takes." "Still to these persons we feel nought but good will, while for their *errors* we have no more charity than for sin in any other form." Nor quite so much ; but let that pass.

"In the discharge of our duty we have spoken plainly and fearlessly," &c. Displayed much more courage than wisdom, and more zeal than prudence. "What I have written I have written" ; yes, Pilate, thou hast written, but tell me, hast thou not written something which ere long you will be glad to efface ?

Before I leave the Preface permit me to return to this extract—"we believe they are radically wrong in their theorising, and by consequence radically wrong in their practice." I shall notice the principle here inculcated in another place ; at present it must not be passed over that the position laid down by the Doctor is as false in practice as it appears imposing in theory. For instance. The scripture commands, "Be ye holy as I am holy." This is the theory of every Christian ; is he by consequence holy ? Besides, some Christians believe in a state of absolute perfection, while on earth their theory is "sinless perfection" ; does their conduct by consequence indicate a state of sinless perfection ? Instances of this kind might be quoted without number to show that between theory and practice there is not always the relation of cause and effect, nor even of antecedent and consequent. I mention this here, not because there is any incongruity between the principles and theory of abolitionists, and their practices, but because there is sometimes a vast incongruity between the pretensions and actual accomplishment of a writer.

Having noticed the Doctor's Preface, I will advert for a moment to the debut of Mr. Howlett. I cannot omit mentioning that I considered this a hoax for some time ; but veritable is the history, and truly is the man Heman Howlett, a citizen of New-York, or else I have been imposed upon by a person claiming the name and production. I shall notice only one sentence in this admirable author's preface, and this merely to show the state of perfection to which the art of logic has been brought—so clear that a way-

far-seeing man may understand it. After running over the history of the world, and enumerating the Cæsars and Pompeys and Catalin-  
 nis, &c. that have figured in history; after telling of the horrid  
 massacres that have disgraced humanity until the page looks red  
 and bristling, he saith "God forbid that we should ever have a  
 civil war in this country, for of all nations we are best calculated  
 to live under one Government, and for the same reasons worse cal-  
 culated to divide." Admirable logic! I mean admirable presen-  
 tation of the truth! very perspicuous! For by this very rule I  
 have (it is so clear) come to the conclusion, that I am a colored  
 man. I am not a white man, and for the same reason I am a co-  
 lored man. This is all I have to say respecting Heman's preface.  
 I would not have selected even this sentence, were it not to contrast  
 his obvious, plain, mathematical mode of reasoning with the rot-  
 tenness and sophistry of his compeer and coadjutor Dr. Reese, and  
 thus making good what is said in the preface, viz. that Howlett is  
 the better writer of the two.

Dr. Reese commences his *extinguisher* by stating that he is "going  
 at once to the fountain head of the Anti-Slavery Society;" that he  
 is going to be very fair—to treat that society "according to the  
 principles of their constitution, and to judge of these principles  
 from their report, and to censure no man except when sustained in  
 that publication." This is very nice and fair. In the next place  
 he avows himself to be "the uncompromising enemy of slavery,"  
 &c.; he disclaims the allegation of being "either an advocate or  
 apologist for slavery," &c.; but he says that "slavery exists in  
 our land, and its existence is provided for by the Constitution of  
 the Union," and it is plainly inferred from what follows that he  
 considers slavery no crime or sin, from the fact that it "is provided  
 for by the Constitution." What does he say? Why he censures  
 abolitionists for saying that "slave holding is a heinous crime or  
 sin in the sight of God." The exordium concludes by inviting  
 attention to the report itself, which he attempts to stigmatise by a  
 host of epithets, which I have not time or patience to mention.

After inserting a long paragraph from the Anti-Slavery Report,  
 he proceeds—"Such presumptuous effrontery on the part of these  
 novices in philanthropy—of these raw recruits in the cause of  
 emancipation, if their insignificance did not forbid it, it would sub-  
 ject them to the derision of the universe." It is truly ludicrous to  
 hear such a man as David M. Reese call Arthur Tappan a "novice  
 in philanthropy," &c. I hold truth to be sacred by all men, and  
 when I hear professors of religion and ministers of the gospel  
 trifle with it, it really makes me sad. Now, Dr. Reese knows  
 very well that most of these men whom he calls "novices in phi-  
 lanthropy," &c. have been philanthropists for years, and are cele-  
 brated for their benevolence and philanthropy. But that is one  
 way of choking the truth. Now, after all, what is the obnoxious

class? why it appears there is only one exceptionable sentiment; it is as follows: "*Till the organization of the New England Anti-Slavery Society in 1832, there was scarcely a rill of pity for the slave.*" Is this consummate arrogance? Try it. Abolitionists and the framers of the Anti-Slavery Constitution, and the writers of the report were not ignorant of the names and deeds of the illustrious worthies mentioned by Dr. R. They were intimately acquainted with their history; their memory was dear and their works remembered and appreciated by them; but, after all, considering the small amount of good effected for the people of color, compared with our sufferings, and what has been done since '32 for our elevation, it may be truly said, that "scarcely a rill of pity" has been felt for the *slave*; and the pity that colonizationists have for the "*free*" is like the pity of the *spider* for the *fly*. The Doctor makes a grand parade of the public schools in the Free States for the *free*, to prove the amount of "*pity for the slave*" prior to 1832. What a logician! To know the amount of pity toward the colored population of this country, let the colonization riots and mobs of New-York and Philadelphia speak for the *free*! Let the iron that enters into the soul of the slave; let the bloody whip of the cruel taskmaster; let the cries, tears, groans and blood of three millions of American bondmen tell how large is the stream of pity that flows in America to wash the wounds of bleeding humanity! Dr. R. confounds the deeds of statesmen and the designs of politicians with pity, as if nothing has been done for the colored population which did not originate in pity, or was incorporated with it. This is another instance of his admirable logic.

"Such shameless extravagance and brazen untruths would indicate the charitable imputation of insanity upon its authors. &c.' One scarcely knows how to restrain his indignation when reading such fulsome railing. Dr. R. speaks here of insanity, and truly if insanity consists in extravagance of expression, he is entitled to that epithet most richly. How different is the style of Heman Howlett, with all becoming modesty,—he says, in the very commencement of his address—"Fellow citizens—it is with no small degree of diffidence that I address you on this important subject, a diffidence in my abilities to do justice to such an important question, while my finer feelings of sensibility vibrate from my heart" and so forth; and then after finishing his introduction, he gravely (not in a sneering ridiculous manner,) asks the question—"is colonization and gradual emancipation preferable to immediate emancipation?" and then like a man who sets his work before him, he describes the whole condition of Africa, in all its several bearings to the four cardinal points; he tells of its history since the world began, its civil, moral, and religious condition both now and for time past; dwells with pathos upon its animal kingdom—"its lion, leopard, and tiger," and charms by

his mellifluous strains in describing the "sweet melody of the nightingale, the lark, and the robin." But what of this description, the geography, &c. of Africa? These are but preliminary remarks used as a scholium or something of that kind they say in logic--something from which a whole gang of sweeping inferences are to be drawn. Next follows a description of the inhabitants--the inhabitants, yes, of Africa! Hear! The original inhabitants of Africa, (says Heman) were the posterity of Ham, and settled in the country which the negroes now inhabit. It seems there was a curse pronounced against this said Ham and his posterity by his father Noah, which reads as follows, (9th chap. Genesis, 24th, 25th, 26th, and 27th verses) "And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his youngest son had done unto him, and he said, "cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren, &c." After several texts, he proceeds:--"now these passages appear perfectly clear that Ham and his posterity are cursed by the 9th chapter of Genesis," Here is demonstration work for you--the Old Book for it! Now in view of all these "facts and arguments," Howlett infers very logically that the "African, when even enslaved in this country, is better off than he is in his own;" and Mr. H. superadds many powerful reasons. This is a strong argument in favor of Colonization!! Dr. Reese, in page 13 says, "Here it cannot be denied that the doctrine of amalgamation of the races so frequently disclaimed is manifestly broached." What is the *here* at which the Dr. starts? I cannot insert the whole, but take what appears the most appropriate to the Dr.'s position. "Let some of our higher institutions *trample on the cord of caste!* open their doors to all, *without distinction of complexion.* We trust that the friends of the oppressed will not be slow to support an institution which promises so much to the cause of humanity in its struggle with prejudice and the foul spirit of *caste.*" If Dr. Reese has seen or perceived any thing in the paragraphs cited which inculcated the doctrine of amalgamation, I would be glad were he to set it forth. The truth is, his assertion is blank and unsupported, and he leaves it so and goes on with a passage of the most silly trash that can be thought of, first quoting a long paragraph from the A. S. Report and then declaring--this is amalgamation. He says, "hereafter it will be utterly vain for the society, or any of its officers or members to enter a disclaimer of any design to promote or encourage amalgamation by intermarriages, unless they disclaim marriage as being among those happy and elevating institutions which are open to others, &c." Here is a contemptible begging of the question. Will it not satisfy a man if he be plainly told in the language of the disclaimer, "*that no amalgamation by intermarriage is intended?*"



The question now is, shall Dr. Reese's interpretation of the report be taken as the meaning of the society? or shall Arthur Tappan, &c. be believed upon their deposition?

But says the Doctor, "if there remains doubt" of the design of the society, look at this: "Let it be the glory of our sons and DAUGHTERS to have been educated in seminaries which were open to worthy applicants *without regard to complexion*, that the NEXT GENERATION be disenthralled from those narrow and *despicable* prejudices which have trammelled the present." Upon this the Doctor thus remarketh: "Here is the outrageous proposition of these visionary enthusiasts, by which they fully declare their purposes, and if these unnatural objects could be attained, the next generation would indeed have potent and omnipotent reasons for being disenthralled, for we should then be a nation of mulattoes and mongrels. Such a proposition from any source entitles its authors to the execration of their species." In the first place the Doctor assumes amalgamation by intermarriage which is not taught in the paragraph. Does the destruction of prejudice mean amalgamation by marriage? Who will believe it? No such thing as intermarriages can be deduced or distorted from the premises. Yet Dr. R. calls it an outrageous proposition,"---that is, it is an outrageous proposition, that white and coloured persons should be educated in the same seminaries. What is there outrageous about it? Instead of showing this, Dr. R. leaves the question and launches into the extreme of infatuation, shouting amalgamation most lustily. How delicate and beautiful is his language? "visionary enthusiasts!" "mulattoes and mongrels!" Harem scarem Doctor, are you treating with wild bears and tigers? or have you forgotten that you are yourself a man, and think yourself transformed to a blood-hound? This "amalgamation doctrine has turned your brain! But seriously, how well it sounds to hear such a man as Dr. Reese come out as he says, "fearlessly and boldly," to execrate a whole society! How very wise he must be! Surely wisdom will die with him. Now I suppose it would not be worth while for me to say that the idea of amalgamation has nothing to do with the Anti-slavery Society or immediate emancipation, but the Doctor is a temperance man and so am I, and "black" too, but I guess he will not think me "impudent in" my "broaching doctrines confessedly" popular, to show the "distinctive feature" in his admirable logic! Now read this Doctor---

Question 1st. Are licentiousness, misery, and death the fruits of intemperance? Answer---Yes.

Question 2d. Is immediate and entire abstinence of the use of all intoxicating liquors the only remedy for intemperance? Answer---Yes.

Question 3d. If an advocate for the moderate use of intoxicating liquors, should charge the advocates of a society based upon the principle that immediate and entire abstinence from the use of intoxicating liquors, is the only remedy for intemperance, with advocating or promoting *licentiousness, misery, and death!* would he not be considered a malicious promulgator of *brazen untruths*? Every man who loves the truth must answer--yes. What then? We will return to what the Doctor calls "doctrines confessedly novel" and *unpopular*.

Question 1st. Are licentiousness, amalgamation, insurrection, and bloodshed the fruits of slavery? Answer--Yes.

Question 2d. Is immediate and universal emancipation the only remedy for slavery? Answer--Yes.

Question 3d. If an advocate for gradual emancipation should charge the advocates of a society, based upon the principle that immediate and universal emancipation is the only remedy for slavery, with advocating or promoting amalgamation, insurrection, and bloodshed! ought not the promulgator of such malicious and *brazen untruths* to be entitled to the "execration of his species!" Answer--Every man who loves the truth must answer--Yes, even if it be Dr. Reese himself!

Now, here are two great principles to cure—two great evils which exist in this land, and they both require immediate *repentance*—from what? SIN! The advocates of the first require immediate and total abstinence from the use of all intoxicating liquors, to cure the *evils* of *intemperance*. The advocates of the second require the immediate and total emancipation of the slaves as a cure for the *evils* of *slavery*. And if it is clear that the principles and advocates of temperance are opposed to licentiousness, misery and death, by their influence, it is equally clear that the principles and advocates of immediate emancipation are opposed to licentiousness, amalgamation, insurrection and bloodshed! and as an evidence that the colored population do not desire licentiousness, amalgamation, insurrection and bloodshed, learn their character and condition; contrast the amount of amalgamation, &c. at the North, (according to our number) with that of the South, and when you will prove that the free colored population of this or any other country have been guilty of any *insurrections, &c.* I will prove that right is wrong, that *liberty is not the birth right of man!*—"Amalgamation of the races!" Now I for one detest the idea of amalgamation, but more detest the mean prevaricating spirit that attributes such things to such men as advocate the glorious principles of immediate abolition. What an abominable mass of absurdity, sophistry, and folly, does the review of Dr. Reese upon this subject present? He is fighting against the winds! Could he even prove that amalgamation by intermarriage is a wicked and unnatural thing, which (by the way) he

cannot, he would then have gained nothing, for abolitionists disclaim what he reprobates.

Abolitionists do not wish "amalgamation." I do not wish it, nor does any colored man or woman of my acquaintance, nor can instances be adduced where a desire was manifested by any colored person; but I deny that "intermarriages" between the "whites and blacks are unnatural," and hazard nothing in giving my opinion that if "*amalgamation*" should become popular Dr. R. would not be the last to vindicate it, practically too if *expedient*. How utterly vain and futile are the following remarks, (page 16). "The fact that no white person ever did consent to marry a negro without having previously forfeited all character with the whites, and that even profligate sexual intercourse between the races, everywhere meets with the execration of the respectable and virtuous among the whites, as the most despicable form of licentiousness; is of itself irrefragable proof that *equality* in any aspect in this country, is neither practicable nor desirable. Criminal amalgamation may and does exist among the most degraded of the species, but Americans (what a patriot!) will never yield the sanction of law and religion to an equality so incongruous and unnatural."

Now "that no white person never did consent to marry a negro without having previously forfeited all character with the respectable and virtuous among the whites," *is not true*, unless it is true that a man's "character" depends upon the color of his skin; if it does, which of the two races would "forfeit all character" by intermarrying, the white or the colored? The whites have robbed us (the blacks) for centuries—they made Africa bleed rivers of blood!—they have torn husbands from their wives—wives from their husbands—parents from their children—children from their parents—brothers from their sisters—sisters from their brothers, and bound them in chains—forced them into holds of vessels—subjected them to the most unmerciful tortures: starved and murdered, and doomed them to endure the horrors of slavery! Still, according to Dr. Reese's logic, the whites have virtuous "characters" and we are *brutes*!

"Deem our nation brutes no longer,  
Till some reason you can find,  
Worthier to regard, and stronger,  
Than the color of our kind!  
Slaves of gold! whose sordid dealings  
Tarnish all your boasted powers,  
Prove that *ye* have human feelings,  
*Ere ye* proudly question ours!"

That "an irrefragable proof that our equality in this country is" not "desirable" by many colonizationists is *true*: but "that

our *equality* in any aspect in this country is not practicable" is *false*! What is the reason that a white man cannot marry a female of a different hue without expecting the execration of the majority of the whites? Prejudice is against it; we are human. Why is it argued that our elevation "to an equality" with other Americans is incongruous and unnatural?" Simply because public opinion is against it. Now we don't wish to alter public opinion respecting intermarriages, but *we do* respecting our "equality."---Now we are degraded and ground to the very dust by prejudice. But does it follow from the fact that prejudice *exists*, that "equality in any aspect in this country is neither practicable nor desirable?" If so, it would prove too much. *First*, it would prove that the removal of the prejudice that exists against the religion of Jesus Christ, "is neither practicable nor desirable," a parallel case exactly. Why does Dr. Reese preach the gospel? popular feeling is against it, to a majority, (and a majority constitutes the popular opinion)---to a majority it is unwelcome news; and its success upon this principle, "is neither practicable nor desirable." But has the Dr. never read of nations who had a prejudice against a white skin? Prejudice is not so much dependent upon a natural antipathy as upon education. What then will become of all the frothy expressions or rather execrations against amalgamation?

"Try the loudest advocates for the vincibility of this prejudice" (says the Dr. in a quotation from a transatlantic writer which he makes his own) as it is most unphilosophically called with this touchstone, "marry the negroes to your sons and give your daughters to negroes, and we shall have a different answer from nature than we receive from a misplaced religious profession." This language may be considered most insulting when made a "touchstone" not of a man's willingness to appropriate his daughters to colored husbands, and his sons to colored wives, but a "touchstone," of all the patience that a gentleman and christian ever possessed from Job to the present time.

"Would you be willing to marry a black wife," is a question often asked by colonizationists to members of the A. S. Society. Were I a white man, or was the question reversed and put to me, my reply would be---you had better put your question to colonizationists at the south, who have been so long in a process of training. Why insult gentlemen with a silly, "quirkish," nonsensical interrogative, loped off from the sag ends of extremity. Every man that can read and has sense sufficient to put two ideas together without losing one, knows what the abolitionists mean when they speak of elevating us "according to our equal rights." But why is it that it seems to you so "repugnant" to marry your sons and daughters to colored persons? Simply because public opinion is against it. *Nature* teaches no such "repugnance,"

but experience has taught me that education only does. Do children feel and exercise that prejudice towards colored persons? Do not colored and white children play together promiscuously until the white is taught to despise the colored? How old are children, I mean white children, before this "*natural repugnance*" shows itself? Just old enough to receive the elements of an inculcated repugnance from five to fifteen years of age. In *by-gone* days in New England, the land of steady habits, where my happiest hours were spent with my play mates, in her schools---in her churches---treading my little pathway over her broad hills, and through her deep valleys. When we waded and swam her beautiful silver streams---when we climbed her tall pines and elms and oaks---when we rambled her fine orchards, and partook of sweet fruits---when we followed our hoops and our balls---when we wended our way from the top of the snowy white hills to the valley. When on the icy pond we did skate---till the school-bell would bid us "retire!" Then---then, her morals were rich---she taught us sweet virtue! Then Connecticut, indeed, was the queen of our land!--then *nature*, never, *never*! taught us such sinful "repugnance!" She was *strong* to the contrary. It took the most powerful efforts of a sophisticated education to weaken her hold---

"Fleecy locks and black complexion

Did not forfeit nature's claim;

Skins" did "differ, but affection

Dwelt "in black and white the same."

How could "nature" excite such repugnance," and uneducated children know it not? The southern infant, I mean the white infant, "is suckled at slavery's breast, and dandled on black slavery's knee," and if it was here that nature excited a "repugnance" in the whites against the colored child, could they both suck at one breast? Now all this "repugnance" about which such repugnant ideas are entertained, is identified with public opinion. Let it become fashionable (God grant it never may) for white and colored persons to intermarry and the "repugnance" will vanish like dew before the rising sun; and those who were loudest in the cry against "amalgamation" will be first to advocate it both by precept and example. In south America, white and colored persons live together on terms of perfect equality, no "repugnance" exists natural or artificial; and certainly nature is true to herself. If the "repugnance" of N. America is natural, why is it not natural in S. America. The Dr's. logic on this subject is as false as I believe his heart to be, and just so far as such logic excludes the offices of christian benevolence, it is sinful in the sight of God. The Dr. says much about separate institutions, churches, &c., as if abolitionists, not the Dr. himself, had said "*they must be annihilated.*" A man is sometimes lost

in a dust of his own raising. "If, however, we admit the supposition that they do not contemplate the amalgamation of the races by intermarriages, we think it is a legitimate and necessary inference from these avowals of their report that they are at least "reckless" and regardless as to the result, and that they feel no repugnance, &c. Here, note first, our reviewer says "abolitionists feel no repugnance to intermarriages, should they follow" but he says on the next page, in language already quoted, "no white person ever did consent to marry a negro without having previously forfeited all character with the whites," &c. Strange consistency! Abolitionists then are willing to "forfeit all character!" I would inform the Dr. that abolitionists are no more "reckless of character" than they are tenacious of truth and charity. They propose to do their duty, and leave the consequences with Him who disposes of all things as it seemeth good in his sight. Not like the advocates of heaven-dethroning expediency---they do not pretend to fathom the consequence of things, or penetrate into futurity---it is enough for them to do their duty. Now what a *get off* this is for the Dr.---they are at least reckless and indifferent as to the result," &c. Good gracious! A man does his duty and then is not racked and tortured about the result; what a wretch he must be. The Dr. proceeds. "Indeed if it were not irrelevant to our present purpose, we might here demonstrate that intermarriage is the only possible way in which the African race can ever be elevated either to political or social equality with the whites, if both races are to occupy the same country." I regret that it was not irrelevant to the Dr's. purposes. I would like to have seen the demonstration. A roaring demonstration it must have been---a demonstration against possibility. A demonstration showing that no power nor cause, not even the power of God Himself, can elevate our race in this country, without intermarriages. This is what I call a *stumper*! But the Dr. proceeds with the demonstration. It is relevant after all! How does he make it out. First. All history does not furnish one instance of such an elevation of a degraded population by any other means!" What conclusive evidence is negative testimony? If "all history does not furnish" an example of the case in question, the possibility is not weakened, the evidence is in our favour---for instance. Tom is found dead, Dick is supposed to have murdered him; he is arraigned before the tribunal of his country; every citizen is summoned and sworn; each one avers that he knows nothing of the case in question---is not their negative testimony in favor of the prisoner, and equal to *no* testimony? But suppose one witness deposed that he saw Dick murder Tom, would not this witness in the case be worth more than all the rest? The Jews are called a distinct "degraded" and oppressed people, and the fact that they are in this country without intermarriages, as wealthy and re-

spectable, and as elevated as other citizens, is a conclusive evidence against the Dr's. empty negation, and in favor of our elevation "without intermarriages." Now, in view of this stern fact which stares every body in the face, the Dr's. "dogmatical" assumption, (page 16th, review) above "all civil and political equality," social and domestic equality, &c. appears ridiculous! The case of the Jews is a standing proof that nations and people can live together in the same country, enjoy the same political and domestic equality, and never intermarry. Now I ask an unprejudiced community if the Drs. logic, in this particular, is not "extinguished." How can my brother (as he calls me such) make assertions that sets all the universe at defiance; if I am his brother he must admit that I am a man, and I ask by what authority does my brother declare that I cannot be elevated to an equality with other men in this country? is it beyond the power of God himself to make me equal with my brother? Now brother Reese would you wish to see me elevated to a political and social equality with yourself, provided it can be attained without marrying a woman with straighter hair and a lighter skin than my own? perhaps you would, but I doubt it; if you would, do not tell it, because Col. Stone and Col. Webb will call you a fanatic, a reckless enthusiast, a disorganizer, a bloodthirsty abolitionist, and raise their celebrated *colonization riots*, and have you mobbed, and your property destroyed and burnt in the street, and then they will give "three cheers for James Watson Webb!" And, brother, when you preach, do not tell the people that the Bible requires christians to "do unto others as they would that they should do unto them;" and do not tell them that slavery is inimical to this rule, if you do, the church you preach such doctrines in will be mobbed, if Col. Stone and Colonel Webb know that you preach such doctrine, because "public opinion is against it," and you know you are a very consistent man, brother?

The recklessness of consequences with which the abolitionists are charged in this *extinguishing* book, seem to imply a dread (in the author's mind) that somehow or other, at some future time, prejudice will wear away, and amalgamation in every aspect will predominate. Here the Doctor's logic is itself *extinguished*. If prejudice is invincible, amalgamation can never take place by intermarriages between white and colored persons. Why then is all this rant and poetry about amalgamation, if the *races do not and will not incorporate*? Now as amalgamation seems to be the only bugbear that can be held up against abolitionists, let every candid man ask himself this question—What is the cause of amalgamation between white and colored persons? and after reviewing the North and South he must come to the conclusion that *slavery* is the cause. Then if he wished to check that base and damning prostitution that is fast making the United States "a NA-

TION OF MULATTOES AND MONGRELS," would he not *annihilate* slavery? To me nothing is more disgusting than to see my race bleached to a pallid sickly hue by the lust of those cruel and fastidious white men whose prejudices are so strong that they can't come in sight of a colored skin; ah no! his natural "prejudices" forbid it! Oh delicacy thou hast run mad, and chased thy sister chastity out of the bounds of the Southern States! Thou hast frightened the Doctor too, for not a word does he say about the virtue of Ebon virgins—virgins reared for ——. But I forbear, God knows the truth is appalling enough to make a devil start; disgraceful enough to crimson the face of the whole heavens and make the angels blush!

Page 18. "The following propositions they declare to be now proven in the light of facts, and unalterably and unquestionably established, viz.:

1. The colonization of the free has no tendency to diminish the number of slaves.
2. The free colored population are spontaneously and unanimously opposed to the scheme.
3. Colonies are not adapted to christianize Africa.
4. Nothing but the prejudice of the *whites* renders the removal of the *blacks* at all desirable.
5. The prejudice is conquerable by the moral power of the gospel."

The remarks of Dr. R. upon these propositions are the most stupid, inapt, and out of the way things that I have ever seen or heard. The first three he says, "in the light of facts are *both* arithmetically and morally untrue." The Doctor must be a great mathematician and almost a jesuit in philosophy! Why if 3000 have been sent from this country to Africa, is not the number of slaves in this country diminished? Why to be sure it is; just as plain as two and two are four! No wonder the Doctor has said, "it would therefore be an insult to the understanding of the reader to offer a single commentary, &c. I recollect a little story, as it is short I will relate it.

"An ill-bred boy being out in the woods one day with his father, was astonished at what he thought was a prodigious flock of birds, there were in the flock about 3000. Father, says he, oh! just see, here is the biggest flock of pigeons in the world! Poh! replied the father, that is nothing at all, I have seen flocks so large that if all these came out of it, it would not be diminished at all! Father, says the boy, *that's a lie!*"

If, however, since the formation of the Colonization Society the number of slaves manumitted have been less, other things being equal, (*ceteris paribus*) than it probably otherwise would have been, then:



Proposition number one may be strictly and arithmetically true, yet, the Doctor's bold assertion to the contrary, notwithstanding. It will be difficult to ascertain whether colonization measures have diminished the number of slaves in this country---I believe they have not, and would time permit, and were it not out of place, I would show wherein they have impeded the work of manumission. But in this case I must imitate my opponent, and merely assert, that such is the *fact*!

Proposition 2d is true, strictly *true in fact*, but that the cursed deceitful and aggressive influence of the scheme has made some extremely willing to "consent" to be transported to SI, LI-BERIA! "or else where;" i. e. to the place which the Quixotic scheme conjured up must be admitted. But that does not alter the fact that we are "spontaneously and unanimously opposed" to the deathly "*scheme*!"

When the colonization rioters were influenced by Colonel Stone and Colonel Webb, the editors of the most filthy prints in the country, which are more the organs of the Colonization Society than any other, to mob us and our friends with clubs, stones, brick-bats, &c. When they like friends entered the houses of the sick, the helpless, and the widow, to plunder and destroy, they retreated for their lives; was this an evidence that they are not "spontaneously and unanimously" opposed to *colonization mobs*? Judge ye! The same reason that makes us spontaneously and unanimously opposed to colonization riots, has ever made us "spontaneously and unanimously opposed to the *scheme*" that caused them.

The idea of a riot must always be alarming to every civilized man or woman. But to me the colonization riots were not so alarming as the "great colonization meeting" at the Masonic Hall last October, for this reason: Then (October) the delusive Christian deceiver was like a wanton, decked in all her gaudy attire to allure and to destroy! But now, or in July, she was completely *unfrocked* and so shamefully exposed, that the world

\* That there are individuals, who were among my warmest friends, who have lent or sold themselves to the Colon. Society, I admit; but such a lover of gold is, to the vital interest of the colored Americans, what Arnold was to his country. viz. a TRAITOR. That there are individuals who would not be opposed to the scheme, did it not promulgate the doctrine "that religion cannot do for us here what it can in Africa," I admit; but such individuals do not consider that *causes produce effects*. Now the fact that the society exists at all to operate *exclusively* upon the *free* Americans for wearing *colored* skins, carries a conviction to my mind, that the man who can compromise with the *Amer. Col. scheme*, can compromise with slavery herself; for the Colonization Society is in reality the daughter of slavery—and as a dutiful child should do, she stands between her aged mother and liberty, to defend her from the all-powerful weapons of *light and truth*. But, thanks be to Him who said "let there be light," she has been repeatedly defeated, and she must be totally annihilated before *slavery* can be stabbed to death with the weapons of *light and truth*.

could see her profligacy and judge of her as we do, who have long felt her debasing *influence*! When the Doctor enumerates the Propositions 1st, 2d, and 3d, "and in the light of facts," declares them to be "*both arithmetically untrue*," does he include the 3d proposition? if so, "in the light of facts" this "proposition" also breathes the very essence of *truth*!

By the word "arithmetically" as referred to this proposition I suppose the Doctor means the number of poor native Africans shot down by the colonists under the command of the Rev. Capt. Missionary Lot Carey! whose mode of "christianizing Africa!" was, (according to Ashmun,) to "discharge a cannon-ball into a solid mass of *living flesh*!" which done such faithful execution as to frighten the poor natives into a pious submission. By the term "morally" I suppose the Doctor means the moral power of cannon-balls upon the hearts of the Africans; or the moral power of guns, gun-powder, and rum, spear pointed knives and cutlasses, which the Colonization Society's, &c. Missionaries present to the Africans as their credentials!

That "colonies are not adapted to christianize Africa!" is a self evident proposition. It wants no long process of reasoning; no elaborate theory to prove it---it is a fact! and the Doctor with all his logic has *not*, nor *cannot* make it "arithmetically and morally untrue!" "All History" declares that colonization is adverse to the spiritual interests of any country. What are the effects of Christian colonies upon the red men of the forest, the aborigines of America?

History cannot point us to a colony so well calculated to christianize the heathen as the colony of Puritans which landed upon the rock of Plymouth in 1620! And where are the pious Indians that can refer to the Puritans as their spiritual fathers in Christ Jesus? The soil that was once peaceably pressed with their footsteps, has been drenched with their blood; they are hunted and driven from mount to mount, like the wild beasts of the forest.

Now to the fourth proposition, which the Doctor handles so learnedly. I do not know what to call his mode of logic; as I said before, I never studied logic, but here Dr. Fothergill, Granville Sharpe, Wilberforce and Clarkson, he says are most grossly scandalized. If abolitionists ascribe so "base and criminal" a motive to them, how happens it that their names are so dear to abolitionists. And how happens it that Mr. Frelinghuysen at the great Colonization meeting at the Masonic Hall, last October, spoke of Wilberforce as having been led away by fanaticism. This was not ascribing a base and mean motive to Wilberforce, oh no! because colonizationists can blow hot and blow cold at the same time as may suit their purposes.

The Doctor's mode of treating this proposition is truly most queer and awkward---it looks to me like insanity.

Now, that the great and philanthropic names above mentioned are revered and honored, and beloved and cherished by abolitionists, will not admit of a doubt in the mind of any *sane* man, notwithstanding Dr. Reese's base and criminal motive to impress the public with the belief that these men were not immediate abolitionists.

Here I have caught the Dr. in his own trap; he admits that "prejudice against the blacks is base and criminal!" Yes, "*base and criminal!*" page 19, 3d line, he says "the hardihood which could ascribe so base and criminal a motive to Dr. Forthergill! Granville Sharp, Wilberforce and Clarkson, as *prejudice against the blacks!* merits only our pity and contempt." How does the Dr. expect to get out of this dilemma? If "prejudice against the blacks is base and criminal!" why does the Dr. contend with proposition 5th, which says "This prejudice is conquerable by the moral power of the Gospel." Why say that prejudice is right, is proper. Will he say that prejudice *itself* is not "*base*" or "*criminal!*" Then I ask if the imputation can be? Can it be base and criminal to ascribe a motive to another, which motive is not in itself "*base or criminal?*" Can it be so "*base*" so "*criminal*" as to be a "*hardihood*" even? Now the Doctor in another place acknowledges his own "*prejudices.*" How, I ask, can he have the hardihood to act upon so "*base*" and "*criminal*" principles? He acknowledges, or must acknowledge, according to his mode of reasoning, that it is "the prejudice of the whites alone, that renders the removal of the blacks at all desirable." Now all his "*humane efforts* in behalf of the Colony at Liberia," are founded upon prejudice against us. The ascription of which, to such men as Wilberforce, &c. is "*base and criminal.*" Oh Doctor, thou art caught! Try the fourth "*proposition*" as you will, you will always find that nothing but "the **PREJUDICES** of *whites* renders the removal of the "*blacks*" at all desirable." I care not how many "*Great Good men*" may be in the ranks of Colonization. "Nothing but **PREJUDICE** against us renders our removal at all desirable!" and if we were all to turn "*white*" to-morrow, the Colonization Society would die a Natural Death! and Dr. Reese would have nothing to do but "ring its funeral knell, and sing its funeral dirge, and bewail his lost work!" I don't undertake to say that there are no "*Patriots, Philosophers, Christians and Divines!*" in the ranks of Colonization. That is what is so lamentable. Many of the "*great and good*" are its supporters; even female piety and beneficence is seen to beam forth upon the delusive christian deceiver, in all its brightness. But I deny that Forthergill, Sharpe, Wilberforce and Clarkson were operated upon by motives of *prejudice against us!* They were themselves too much our friends to desire aught for us but good.

Can Dr. Reese say that our "removal" is desired for our good, when the very

Men who *ask* our lives to stake  
In "Afric's clime" to roam,  
Disclose their friendship like a *snake* !  
By *biting* us at home !

If he can, who I ask is Judge? Answer—"PREJUDICE." But I am not yet through with the 4th Proposition; I wish to sift it to the very bottom, as I would every other—I mean the objections to it. The Doctor says all such persons as have the "hardihood, &c." merits his contempt. Well, to fall beneath the pity and contempt of such logicians as Dr. Reese, and to merit their "pity and contempt," is in my opinion punishment enough for the devil himself to bear. This was a home thrust of the Doctor's; what the French call a *chef d'œuvre*.

He proceeds, "Here then we are taught that our distinguished, fellow citizens, Lafayette, Monroe, Madison, Marshal, Jefferson-Bishops White, Meade, Carroll of Carrollton, Bushrod Washington, Henry Clay, Webster, Mercer, Frelinghuysen, and a host of other statesmen, patriots, philosophers, christians, and divines, because they consider the Colonization of our colored population "desirable, must be therefore branded with being influenced by nothing but a prejudice against the blacks." And what if we are taught all this? What an unmeaning parade of names and words, and what does the whole amount to? Why the reviewer says it amounts to this [*juxtaposition*,] "if the authors of this proposition were susceptible of shame they would blush at the infamy it merits." And if Dr. Reese can show any proposition in the foregoing quotations, I will try and *blush* for him. Mark the word "*branded*." The Dr. cannot get it out of his head, that "prejudice against the blacks" is *base*, is criminal, is ignominious, is diabolical! yea, so *diabolical*, that even to ascribe it to the motives of any one is an act so full of the foulest infamy, that shame itself would "blush" for the perpetrator! Why does not the Doctor continue in the same strain? Oh he is now blowing hot; next proposition he blows cold, and in principle disclaims the charge. By supplying one leg or wing, a syllogism may be got out from what the Doctor has said. First he says "prejudice towards the blacks is a base and criminal motive to ascribe to Sharpe," &c.

2nd. It is "infamy" to say that "Lafayette, Monroe, &c." are influenced by nothing but prejudice against the blacks!" What now is the **THEREFORE**, the *third* or conclusion? or must the conclusion be taken in the premise? I don't know the rules of logic, only the *force* of it: must it be said that to ascribe motives of prejudice to any one is base, and therefore "prejudice" itself

is base, criminal, and abominable. However it may come out, the conclusion or premise, both of which will be true if one is, will be this, "prejudice against the blacks" is so wrong and abominable, so odious to both God and man, so contrary to the dictates of justice, and the feelings of humanity, that the "authors of this proposition" which imputes it even to the motives of such benefactors of their race as Sharp, Wilberforce, and others, and such patriots and statesmen as Lafayette, Monroe, &c. would if they were susceptible of shame, *blush at the infamy which it merits.*

Now I want the reader to decide if I have not come to a legitimate conclusion--that it will puzzle the Doctor to get along with proposition 5th. One thing more on this "proposition"--it will be seen that the Doctor is here using the phrase "prejudice against the blacks" as a stool pigeon. By-and-by he makes it a *scarecrow*! One would think that the Doctor and prejudice were great enemies just now. Suppose we should apply the phrase as he conceives of it under proposition 5th, then we will have this syllogism. Prejudice is right--hear what St. Paul says: the Gospel cannot remove it; why, has not the Gospel been beating upon it for 1800 years? But Wilberforce, Lafayette, &c. could not have possessed this prejudice. It were hardihood and infamy, it were base and criminal to impute such motives to them.

Therefore--therefore what? redicalous nonsense. I have been induced thus to notice the Doctor *particularly* upon this proposition, in order to expose not his absurdity only, which must be *manifest* to the dullest apprehension, but to put my readers on their guard against his sophistry.

The fifth proposition declares, "that prejudice is conquerable by the moral power of the Gospel!" Dr. Reese declares, (and what is this but assertion,) "that until the year 1832, the Gospel either had no moral power or failed to exert it." Then what does the Doctor's declaration imply but that the Gospel *has not* moral power to conquer *prejudice*? and what is this but doubting the power of Omnipotence? and how much short does this fall of heresy? Admitting, however, the validity of the Doctor's argument, he proves too much again. By the same rule he may prove that the Gospel has not moral power to convert the world. The Gospel has been preached these 1800 years. Ministers of the Gospel have preached and worn out their lives in the work--societies have been formed of various kinds to send the Gospel to earth's remotest bounds, and yet previous to 1832, the greater part of the world has been in darkness. What? this is but to say, that previous to 1832, the Gospel either had no power or failed to exert it! Yet "the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth." I suppose it will be hereafter, and

so far aught I can see, the Gospel may yet conquer this *prejudice* hereafter.

The Doctor proceeds, "how strange does it appear to the unsophisticated reader of the New Testament to learn from the Holy Evangelist, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the divine author of the Gospel, and the great source of all its moral power never once uttered a single sentence against slaveholding, that heinous crime which is worse than piracy and murder!"

"How strange," that Jesus Christ never uttered a single word against drinking brandy, against building theatres and brothels, and against running steamboats on Sundays, about which no one doubts the wickedness. How strange does it appear, that the Dr. should begin at this breath to advocate slavery? When he set out and declared himself in the 1st page of his Extinguisher, so fearlessly, to be "the uncompromising enemy of slavery, and the friend of *universal emancipation, &c.*---*uncompromising enemy of slavery!*" But "Jesus Christ never uttered a single sentence against it,"---although at the time of our Lord's personal ministry, &c. a system of slavery existed under the Roman government which in point of severity\* far exceeded that of the United States, yet he in no one instance bore testimony *against this heinous crime in the sight of God!*

Now if Dr. Reese was a consistent upholder and advocate of slavery, I would respect him. But for him, a minister of the Gospel, to declare in the outset to be the *uncompromising enemy of slavery!* and then adduce the words of our Saviour to prove the contrary, entitles him, I will not say to the contempt of the Devil himself.

But I shall proceed and expose his fallacy, while I pity his folly. It is well known, as before printed, that there were many vices which our Lord and Saviour never reprov'd, either because they did not come under his immediate inspection or because they

\* If Dr. Reese was subject to the following treatment, which is common in the United States, would he maintain that the slaves are "treated with less severity in the U. States than under the government of Rome? would he or any friend of the colonization scheme pronounce slavery to be simply an *imaginary evil*? or would the Doctor maintain that slavery is right. "When I was a boy," said my beloved friend, "in a short ramble from my father's house I encountered a neighboring farmer who had a colored citizen tied to a large log of a tree lying on the ground. The man was lying on his face uncovered, from his neck downwards. His driver had been lacerating him most unmercifully until his back was one entire mass of blood and flesh cut up in pieces, which were commingled and slowly amalgamating together. To complete the torture of his writhing victim who could scarcely move on account of the tightness with which his hands and neck and feet were bound to the tree, the citizen flayer caught a large cat, and so fastened the animal that in endeavoring to get loose the cat's talons continually tore the slave's already gory back, until the villain's vengeance was glutted when he released the cat, administered the usual plaster, *salt, pepper, vinegar, &c.* and ordered the son of anguish to resume his labor.--*Bourne's Picture of Slavery in the U. S. p. 129.*

were species of wickedness, the general principle of which was reprov'd and condemn'd ; or, whatever species of wickedness was not openly *reprov'd or condemn'd specifically* and in *detail*, underwent the *general* enunciation of God's displeasure ; and the distinctive vices were to be known from characteristic principle, and left to the judgment and discrimination of Christians and men. Now our Saviour never said any thing against drinking ardent spirits, yet from the principles of temperance and sobriety which the Gospel inculcates, I infer that to drink ardent spirits is wrong. Our Saviour never spoke distinctly against slave-holding. But he said, " whatever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye the same to them, for this is the law and the prophets."

Here is the spirit of the Gospel. Now it would seem unnecessary to have added—*and if any man have slaves, and these slaves possess the same right to freedom that he does himself, and if he being a slave could wish for freedom, let him give his slaves freedom.* I say the principle of the commandment is diametrically opposed to slavery in every shape. How then could the Rev. Dr. Reese undertake to justify slavery, by declaring that " our Lord Jesus Christ, the divine author of the Gospel never uttered a single sentence against slaveholding ?" Now let it be understood, that although slavery existed, neither our Lord nor his apostles, as often as the latter had occasion to speak of submission of servants to their masters, never once admitted the *spirit* of slavery as justifiable. Nero, Cesar, and Herod were all wicked rulers and oppressors, and yet neither Christ nor his apostles openly (as I recollect) reprov'd their sins and oppression. Were they therefore good men ? Jesus Christ commanded his ministers thus—Go ye into all the world, and teach my Gospel to all mankind ! And slavery in the United States **FORBIDS** that this Gospel shall be preached---that His name shall be taught to three millions of his creatures in this land of Bibles ! Still the Rev. Dr. Reese and other professing Christians will wink at slavery, apologise for slavery, and even undertake to prove to the world that "*Jesus Christ never once uttered a single word against slavery !*"

Now if slavery is not inimical to all the truths and precepts of our Lord Jesus Christ, the divine author of the gospel, what prevents christians from furnishing three millions of their own countrymen and women with his Holy Bible ? And if it is, why do not Christians obey the divine author, by entering upon the path of duty, and " break every yoke, and undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free." It is out of my province to ministerialize ; as I said before, I am no preacher, but the Rev. Dr. Reese's inconsistent and anti-christian mode of interpreting the Bible it must be admitted is enough to alarm the most impenitent. For this reason ; if those who are sent to preach the gospel are

reckless of its principles, the impenitent will be reckless of his condition, and like the blind leading the blind they may all fall into the ditch together.

Having taken up this subject as Dr. Reese has left it, with a resolution to dissect every limb, the reader will bear with me should I be a little tedious. We must return to the slavery under the Roman government, &c. Here I admit that submission to tyranny was taught by Paul; is tyranny therefore justifiable? Paul said "be subject to the powers that be," even the impious tyrannical rule of Nero; did Paul therefore abet tyranny, and was tyranny right? Upon the same principle of submission to powers that be, over which we have no individual control, Paul says to servants, "be obedient to your masters"—suppose the servants to have been slaves, (which was not the case), did Paul advocate slavery? Certainly not. I have no doubt his meaning was this: Servants, by the providence of God you occupy this condition in life; prove by your submission that christianity is profitable in every condition of life and every department of society; but if thou canst obtain freedom, use it rather—be free rather than servants, if by any justifiable means thou can'st; do all in thy power to raise thy condition from servants to freemen. But the question arises, were those whom Paul addressed servants according to our definition of the word *slaves*? Being unlearned, I have no means of determining; but will grant the worst, and suppose they were slaves. The severity of their treatment did not very far exceed that of the slaves in the United States! I defy the annals of the world to produce a parallel of cruel treatment to that of some of the slaves in the United States.

Dr. Reese asks, "is it not strange that our Lord did not abrogate that part of the moral law which as much forbids the coveting of a man servant and a maid servant, as the coveting of any other species of property?" This looks very far-fetched. It is passing strange to me if the Dr. can find any thing to take hold of here. What of a man servant or a maid servant? they were held by the Israelites according to the permission of God, with strict regulations as to their treatment, their terms of services, &c., very much as bound apprentices and men and maid servants are at the present time among us. But they were sometimes held as property. Well, if they were, God had given their masters permission. They were captives, and the like, of the neighboring nations who had, according to God's express declaration, forfeited freedom. But has he decreed that we being guilty of a colored skin have forfeited freedom? Was this *law* which gave the Israelites a right to hold slaves (if slaves they were) a part of the *moral law*? If so, why was not the *law* commanding the Israelites to make war and exterminate the Cananites of *moral* obligation, till time shall end? But where is the proof that slavery is consistent



with the *moral law* of God, or a part of it? Suppose it to be true that slavery is now justifiable under the *law* by which God gave the Israelites permission to hold slaves, then the Jews, and *none but the Jews*, are justifiable in holding slaves, and they have a right, according to Dr. Reese's logic, to tear him (Dr. R.) from the bosom of his family, and lacerate his body with the bloody whip, bind him in chains and consign him to serve under the most cruel taskmaster; yes, reader, and to tear the little infant from the bosom of its mother and separate them for ever; and if she, like Rachel, weeps and mourns, and refuses to be comforted because her infant is not,---the cruel monster has taken it away---she may be chained and whipped, and tortured, at the will of her cruel and fiendish blood thirsty oppressor. Such is the treatment to which three millions of my race are subjected by slavery in this christian land; and if Dr. Reese's mode of reasoning be correct, the Jews have a right to subject those who wear the whitest skins (even the Dr. himself) in the land, to the same unmerciful degradation. Do you believe Rev. Dr. Bishop that this would be right? Would you believe slavery to be an "imaginary evil"? Would you believe that the system of slavery, as it existed under the Roman government, in point of severity, far exceeded that which exists in the United States? If you did, would not the removal of slavery be at all desirable?

Here the Doctor says he thinks it is passing strange that, if slavery is a crime, "that our Lord did not abrogate that part of the *moral law* which as much forbids the coveting of a man servant as a maid servant, as the coveting of any other property." I will not say how ridiculous, for it is disgusting to hear a writer stop so often with his exclamations of how *preposterous*, what *brazen untruths*, *presumptuous effrontery*, and the like. But if there is not something ridiculous and nonsensical in the above, I don't know what *nonsense* is.

If Doctor R. should build a house, and appropriate one room (constructed for the purpose) to a bedlamite, would he, after the death of its inmate, demolish the house for the sake of pulling down the room? Why is not that part of the tenth commandment "abrogated," which speaks of "thy neighbour's ass," to such countries as have no such animals, except bipeds?

Why is not that part of the tenth commandment "abrogated" which says "nor any thing that is thy neighbour's?" Here is length and breadth enough without straining at the word "servant;" "*any thing*," any thing that is thy neighbours, any thing which he holds in his possession, whether lawfully or not, is no concern of thine. "Thou shalt not covet" it! Is not this the spirit of the command? To whom pray is the command given, to "thy neighbour or to thee?" If it be admitted that the command not to "covet" the man or maid servant of our neighbour, be

founded upon the right of our neighbour, to hold man and maid servants, then it will follow very clearly that we may "covet" whatever our neighbour possesses which he has not obtained or inherited lawfully. Now, to any person willing to admit the truth, the meaning is very plain. The command is to us to do our duty in relation to our neighbour, and it makes no more compromise with slave-holding, and yields it no more encouragement than the Deity did with Satan, when he forbade Michael the Arch-angel to rail against him. We may readily suppose that God, when he gave the commandments to be of moral and perpetual obligation, foresaw that the cupidity of ambitious and despotic men, would place others in subjection to them. What, then? The fact only is admitted, not the propriety or right, or justice of the thing; and we owe duties to all men, whether they be tyrants or oppressors, or whatever they may be. But the Doctor seems to take it for granted that the clause "man servant and maid servant" means *male and female slaves*. I have shown that granting this to be the meaning, his application is totally wrong. The meaning of man servant, and maid servant, as used in the tenth commandment, appears however to me to be this: viz. That state of subordination and subjection which must necessarily fall to the lot of *some*, seeing that society is composed of different grades; but which subordination is not incompatible with civil liberty, and the heaven born doctrine of *equal rights*. Did God ever intend a time, when every one from the least to the greatest should have a jubilee from sin? A day of Millennial glory, continuing a thousand years, when there will be no need for a man to say to his neighbour, know the Lord, but when all shall know him from the least to the greatest. If such a time comes I would ask Dr. Reese where slaves are to be procured? for the Rev. man (page 26 R.) vindicates slaveholding from the fact, that they (the slaves) never were free, or had forfeited their freedom. But when the Millenium shall come, no man will forfeit his freedom by his crimes, or by the color of his skin, and then I suppose the obnoxious part of the tenth commandment referred to, will be "abrogated," surely it will be useless then, or else slave holding is now absolutely and unequivocally and unqualifiedly right. The Doctor did not look far enough a-head this time. He will be just now in his trap again.

He says slavery is right, *absolutely*, or else the tenth commandment would be different--(page 26,) "crime makes slavery conditionally right." Therefore, when the Millenium shall come, and no crime be committed, "slavery" will be absolutely right, or else that part of the tenth commandment which speaks of "men and maid servants," will be abrogated. Now I have followed the Doctor through the above syllogism; and have attributed nothing to him but what is rationally inferred; and I ask the candid reader,

whether this man, this same Rev. Dr. Reese, is the clear "*unsophisticated reasoner*," the "*uncompromising enemy of Slavery*?" Does this proposition as Doctor R. says (page 20) "most absolutely and impiously" charge "the Son of God either with ignorance of the *moral* power of His own Gospel, or with a most unaccountable omission, either to explain or enforce it!"

What is the proposition? The Dr. cites Luke, ch. 22d, 7th and 8th verses, the recognition of slavery, or as I would say of servitude by our Saviour: so "our Saviour" recognised tyranny, yea, and murder, and adultery, too! How long will the enemies of Emancipation harp upon this old string; this old worn out string? I must confess I am a little surprised, that the Doctor should attempt the vindication of slavery. I scarce can guess his motive—surely he knows better. I thought his purity always said that the only difference between colonizationists and abolitionists, consisted in the manner of getting *rid* of slavery. The question about the lawlessness of slavery being agreed upon; but here comes the minister of the Gospel, long accustomed to the interpretation of the scriptures—long "accustomed," as Howlett saith with great felicity, with "forensic speaking and forensic debate," to teach an entirely new doctrine to vindicate the cause of slave holders, and like Mr. Gurly, "*go with the south.*"

I shall pass over the Doctor's ribaldry, as being totally beneath criticism: an author, whose writings, one half at least, consists of opprobrious epithets, and terms of reproach, and slanderous imputations, is in fact, beneath my notice; but as no one else has condescended to notice so base and wicked a slanderer of God and man, I have reluctantly stooped to examine his *sewer*. As to elegance of style, or diction, I have none. To the charms of eloquence I do not aspire; but to speak of my neighbours with decency, is a *virtue* I hope to possess, and which even a sable skin cannot conceal. For sake of demonstrating the truth, and exposing error, when pleading my own cause, the cause of suffering humanity! I may sometimes err in extravagance of speech, when I reflect that it is the complexion only, with which *Nature* has clothed me, that merits the execration of some of my race, whom she has blessed with a paler *hue*. But if such has been my failing toward Doctor R. or any one else, it is with pleasure that I beg pardon; and I will endeavor at all times to keep my pen subjected to *reason* rather than *insanity*.

But Heman Howlett must not be neglected. The most that he has to say in favor of that slavery, than which to man, death is less terrific! is contained in the following extract. "They (meaning slaves) become civilized and tamed, but on the contrary they are in a wild and savage state in their own country, and no one will attempt to prove that the slave is worse off in the *United States* than he is in the *West India Islands*."

I have not garbled: the argument stands connected here as it did in H's. address, and I will now leave my readers to draw the conclusion. I shall now return to Dr. Reese, and prove, I trust, to the satisfaction of the reader, that there is nothing in the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in opposition to the laws of our country, or the law of God; and that the attempt of the Rev. gentleman to fasten such a stigma or imputation upon it, is not only an utter failure, but a misrepresentation and perversion, entirely out of character with an M. D. or Bishop. Before I commence that, however, permit me to notice the Doctor's quotation (page 24) from Leviticus, ch. 30: 44, 56 v. He says "We introduce this quotation, because it is equally applicable with that in the report, though neither of these can legitimately be claimed; as having the least bearing on American Slavery. It may serve to show, however, that even Satan can quote scripture, and often does it when he lieth in wait to deceive."

I have introduced this quotation from Doctor R., to show that if the quotation to which he alludes, cannot be "legitimately" claimed, as having the least bearing on A. Slavery; then he has been building all this while upon a false foundation, for it is the "bearing" which the Jewish has upon A. Slavery upon which he predicates the right of holding slaves. It may be seen also, and it must be admitted, that Dr. Reese can quote scripture as well as Satan, and that the scripture is no less true in itself, whether the Doctor or the Old Gentleman himself "quote" it. The Doctor, recollect, a little while ago, acknowledged the Jewish Law in relation to A. Slavery in his exegesis upon the tenth commandment; but now this law is not applicable to the case. This is a twisting about and changing of grounds, which looks very suspicious, very much like one who "lieth in wait to deceive."

Now to the constitution: The Doctor makes a long quotation from the Anti-Slavery Report, and then puts on the "extinguisher." "If this be not unsophisticated Nullification, we have yet to learn an instance in the history of our country. We invite a reference to the several expressions, which are italicised, and pass on without any farther comment!" Pass on without any farther comment! This is a pretty easy way of passing on--of *extinguishing!* The Doctor ought to have a patent for his "extinguisher!" But I will not "pass on" thus without any farther comment. I am willing to examine all the *italicised* expressions and italicise others for the Doctor's inspection.

The first italicised sentence in the quotation is *the iniquitous law!* Hear it: Americans! Abolitionists have the hardihood, and I might say the treason too, to call the law of our country *iniquitous!* As my limits will not allow me to comment upon each individual *italicised* word separately, I will go on to establish the general truth: viz. That nothing can be deduced from

the principles or the practices of abolitionists, to prove that they have any desire to resist the "laws of our country" or to violate the constitution.

Abolitionists say that the laws are *iniquitous laws*. Colonizationists, if they are "patriots and christians," must say the same. Why are these laws wrong? Because they are in opposition to the laws of God, and the Declaration of our Independence, and the genius of our constitution: "iniquitous, unjust laws!" Well now it is a fact that they are *iniquitous laws*! And I ask is it "treason," is it nullification to say so? Is he who utters the obnoxious sentiment a traitor to his country? Ah Doctor, no: gag and sedition laws will never go down in a land of free investigation, unless it be that free investigation is itself the reprobated sentiment. If it be nullification, or treason, or wickedness to say, that a "law" is iniquitous; I ask where is the man in this Republic that does not justly fall under the censure? "Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people," is a precept of divine warrant, stronger than the obligation of a wicked or iniquitous law. And yet, who does not know that our venerable President has been the mark of ridicule and abuse, and has been evilly spoken of by I suppose one half of the people of these United States. I wonder if every one who has thus spoken evil against him is not an enemy, a dangerous enemy to his country? But there are many thousands who pass sentence of execration upon every law that is passed in our State and National Legislatures.

In the first place legislatures declare with all the pathos of anger and declamation, that such a measure, such a law is *iniquitous*, oppressive, and tyrannical? (I wish I had done with refuting the stale trash, but it must be got through with. Be patient reader.) If so, I ask if such are not dangerous men, and who are these men? Who? who are not in their ranks? No wonder the Doctor passed on "without any further comment!" I have no doubt he has himself said, of some law, perhaps the Bank law, if he be a Jackson man, that it is *iniquitous*. I have heard men say so, and the contrary, with earnestness, and then pray as earnestly for the President and the preservation of the Constitution of the United States. This seems somewhat paradoxical to be sure, but so paradoxical are things that we know to be true. One ought to be a divine and study what they call casuistic theology, to see through some of these things.

"Abolitionists have called slaveholders, robbers and pirates." Did the Doctor ever call a drunkard a beast? I think it will be conceded, that the individual who steals a man and sells him, if according to the lenity of some charitable colonizationists he ought not to be put to death, must, nevertheless, in all justice be termed a thief or a robber! But I will get the dictionary lest I make mistakes in terms. "Walker says robber is a thief, one that

robs by force or steals by secret means." He then that steals a man is a robber; then is not he who buys the stolen man a robber? most assuredly. The laws of all nations necessarily recognize the thief and the receiver of stolen things as equal and as identified in guilt. Walker says, "piracy is the act or practice of robbing on the sea." Now is not the business of slavery accomplished both by sea and land? if so, then are not the men engaged in the nefarious traffic of catching men, women, and children, chaining and cramming them in the *middle passage*, and torturing them with handcuffs, shackles, thumb-screws, *speculum orisis*,\* and those who buy and sell and whip and murder them, robbers and pirates, according to the principles laid down in the above definition? Most assuredly they are. The principle is recognised by a'l law, that the buyer is equal in guilt to the civil kidnapper or primary thief, because he participates with him in the crime. Then every transfer of these stolen men, women, and children, however remote, brings along with it a transfer or inheritance of the original guilt---hence the sin of kidnapping, of piracy and robbing belongs to every slaveholder.

Now make the case your own, reader. Suppose you were kidnapped in Africa and consigned to the *middle passage*, and there tortured with handcuffs and shackles and thumb-screws and *speculum orisis*, &c. and afterwards bought by an American Christian, who would still keep you chained and yoked under the influence of the bloody lash to till the earth. Would you not think he who bought you participated equal in guilt with him who kidnapped you? But suppose the buyer should sell you to another who chained and caged you "within an iron-grate," and suppose he should say, "you are my property sir, be quiet, stop

\* In order that the reader may have a clear conception of the cruelty that my down-trodden race are subjected to by the nefarious traffic in our blood and sinews, which the Rev. Dr. Reese attempts to justify before God and man, I will, for your information, and for the sake of my race, see the engraving on the 16th page of Mrs. Child's "Appeal." It is explained thus: "The engraving, &c. will help to give a vivid idea of the Elysium enjoyed by the negroes during the Middle Passage. Fig. A represents the iron handcuffs which fasten the slaves together by means of a little bolt with a padlock. B represents the iron shackles by which the ankle of one is made fast to the ankle of his next companion: yet even thus they do often jump into the sea, and wave their hands in triumph at the approach of death. E is a thumb-screw. The thumbs are put into two round holes at the top; by turning a key a bar rises from C to D by means of a screw; and the pressure becomes very painful. By turning it further the blood is made to start, and by taking away the key at E, the tortured person is left in agony, without the means of helping himself or being helped by others. This is applied in case of obstinacy, at the discretion of the captain. F is a speculum oris. The dotted lines represent it when shut---the black lines when open. It opens at G, H, by a screw below with a knot at the end of it. This instrument was used by surgeons to wrench open the mouth in case of lock jaw. It is used in slave ships to compel the negroes to take food, because a loss to the owners would follow their persevering attempts to die. [Reader are we human?] K. represents the manner of stowing a slave ship."

your noise ; don't you know you are better off than you were before I got you ?" and suppose he should consign you to toil and water the earth with your tears as did the other ; would you not think him cruel and equal in guilt with the other ? But suppose your hard-hearted master dies, and the son who has witnessed his father's cruel and unjust assumption of power over you, should say, " you are my property, I am become your master by inheritance"---and should treat you equally as cruel as the father, tell me would you think him more just than his father ? Would he not be the recipient of that which was stolen and justly denominated a *thief, robber, and pirate*, and cognizable by the *law*, (if the laws were not *iniquitous*,) as such ? Tell me would he have any more right in you than the father had---the father any more right than those who bought you from the kidnapper ? and had the man who bought you from the kidnapper himself any right ? If you are sane you must answer NO !

Tell me then would it be right, would it be charitable that he (the son) should be screened from the rigor of a just law, by his countrymen, by patriots and Christians, and ministers of the Gospel !

Would not rather the wicked example of his father furnish the opportunity for reflection and amendment, and the warning of God himself in regard to the treatment of our fellowmen aggravate his guilt and make him more criminal in his sight than his father, or the other *cruel kidnappers, robbers and pirates* ? Most assuredly it would ! Why is it that God pours out his wrath upon one generation for the accumulated sins of several preceding ones, unless that the example of one generation contains in its motives and reasons, and incentives for the correction of the next.

And tell me how many transfers must be made before the recipient becomes innocent, or freed from the original charge. Is not the inheritor, according to the above reasoning, more guilty than the original kidnapper who tore *our fathers from their native land* ? And does not every successive generation of slaveholders become more and more guilty ? But again, in the supposition of the reader's being kidnapped, chained, sold, caged, inherited, &c. I ask if the *son* (the inheritor,) be very mild and gentle, full of suavity and professed philanthropy, and should say, " sir, I am very sorry for your condition, and I should be glad from my soul to help you ; slaveholding is a sin I know *in the abstract*, but I inherited you, and therefore this sin of slaveholding is no sin of mine, besides if I were to let you go, it would be doing you an injury, you cannot provide for yourself---you see how kind I am to keep you from starvation---and moreover, you have been treated so bad in times past, and for divers reasons as

you think, that really I am afraid that if I were to release you, you would turn about and "cut my throat." What sir, would you reply to such a man? Ah! you would say—"presumptuous effrontery! consummate arrogance! and brazen untruths!" allied to insanity! if thou wert "susceptible of shame," thou wouldst blush at the infamy thou meritest!\* But slaveholders must not be called robbers and pirates. Oh no; innocent men—gentlemen and "Christians;" they inherited slaves! What, inherited evils, all of which the poor original kidnappers must give an account! Oh if it be so: and if the sin of the son, or the evil of slavery must go backward and be visited upon the father, and if there be a purgatory or a hell, what concentrated wrath and fury must be the portion of original kidnappers!! But according to Dr. R.'s principle of reasoning, the children of Adam need not fear, the Devil will suffer for all!

It seems to me however, that a Christian of the North may call a slaveholding Christian of the South, a "robber and a pirate," while at the same time, he discharges his duty in the exercises of brotherly love. Christians and intelligent men of the South, understand abolitionists when they say the slaveholder is a robber and a pirate. They know the phrase is not used as an opprobrium or for the purpose of exciting their displeasure, but to call things by their right names, to speak to them the truth, however hard that truth may be. Abolitionists deal with principles, and when they apply them to men it is specifically and appropriately. If I may be understood, an abolitionist of the North says to a slaveholder, "thou mayest be a gentleman, a Christian, an honest man, and a good citizen, except in the relation which thou holdest to thy brother man a slave, in this justice and truth compel me to denominate thee a *robber and pirate*! I love thee and wish thee well. but slavery is robbery and piracy, in these sins you partake—be warned and let the *oppressed go free*. Now I might cite examples from Scripture and otherwise, to show that in the phrases used by abolitionists, there is no impropriety if understood, but I must leave it to the good sense of the reader; meantime I cannot think well of a reviewer that will raise a *hue and cry*, to excite the passions without attempting to inform the understanding, but rather leading them away from the subject, by the incongruous

\* "Disguise thyself as thou wilt, still, slavery! still thou art a bitter draught; and although thousands, in all ages, have been made to drink of thee, thou art no less bitter on that account. It is thou, Liberty! thrice sweet and gracious goodness, whom all in public or in private worship; whose taste is grateful, and ever will be so till nature herself shall change. No tint of words can spot thy snowy mantle, or chymic power turn thy sceptre into iron. With thee, to smile upon him as he eats his crust, the swain is happier than his monarch from whose court thou art exiled. Gracious Heaven! grant me but health, thou great bestower of it! and give me but this fair goodness as my companion; and shower down thy mitres, if it seem good unto thy Divine Providence, upon those heads which are aching for them" in this boasted "*land of the free*!"



and incoherent citations of old proverbs and fables. Upon this subject the Doctor says, "his is a most singular definition of piracy, &c. I need not follow him through all his quotations, presuming that I have made it appear very clearly, that slaveholding is robbery and piracy; so I will only notice how the Doctor creeps out and begs the question. He asks, (page 26,) "when was any one of these slaves freemen? or when did he possess the ownership of himself?" Why the Doctor perceives that the slaveholder cannot be a robber or a pirate, because these slaves were never "freemen!" Hear him! "But this reverend agent would find it no easy task to show that the slaves of this country were ever *freemen* even in their ancestry to however remote a period he might trace the genealogy of any individual who descended from a *freeman* even in Africa? Can he furnish the pedigree of any number of them whose forefathers when removed from their own country, were neither prisoners of war or who had not otherwise forfeited their lives by the laws of their own country? or is he ignorant of the palpable and cruel bondage of the tribes of Africa to their petty kings who hold unlimited power over the liberty and even the lives of their subjects?" The Doctor cannot forget the ceremonial and Jewish laws. He said some time ago, that certain "quotations had no relation to American slavery," but here he grounds the right of holding slaves upon their own laws, and irrespective of the Divine law or the Constitution of our country, imparts to the slaveholder in the United States, the right of holding them in slavery! because I suppose the Israelites held bondsmen of their neighbouring nations! (See quotations from Scripture, page 29.) Although the Doctor's attempt to vindicate slavery is totally irrelevant, it being admitted by colonizationists, and even the Doctor himself says that slavery is wrong, yet I will spend a moment upon my last quotation from him in order to show the ridiculous tendency of his interrogations if he intended them as undeniable facts and arguments.

I will in the first place ask the learned and Rev. Dr. Reese a question which if he cannot answer in the affirmative will supersede the necessity of any investigation or research into the "genealogy or ancestry of the slaves." The question is *this*: granting that the "slaves" have been "slaves" in their "ancestry" up to the birth of their progenitor *Cush*, have Americans a right, according to the laws of God and the principles of our independent Republican Government, to purchase and hold them in slavery? -- This is an "Extinguisher" again I know Doctor; but I will proceed upon the reviewer's plan of right, the right of holding slaves. I defy him to show any reason why I might not hold him in slavery if I had the power. Can the Doctor show that his ancestry were *freemen* some ten or a dozen centuries ago, and if they were slaves, (I say they were slaves, because he can-

not prove to the contrary,) how did they obtain their freedom but by some violence, which if it were justifiable, would now justify the slaves of this country in obtaining their freedom! Can he designate any individual whose ancestor ten or twenty generations ago, was a freeman? can he furnish his own pedigree, and say his forefathers were never prisoners of war, or had not in some way forfeited their liberty?

I say *they did* forfeit liberty, because he cannot prove the contrary; but if they did, why are their descendants *free*? (Oh! Africa! it is reserved for thy sons alone, to bear the iniquity of their fathers!) Or is the Doctor 'ignorant of the fact,' that thousands of the settlers of this country were in bondage, sold *for their passage* across the Atlantic? Why in the name of wonder were not they and their descendants kept in slavery? Surely the genius of despotism must have brooded long over the sands of Africa, ere she plumed her murky wings for the visitation of America's shores! Power darker than the blackest midnight, why is it right to enslave our race since all others are *free*? Oh! truth divine, shed one ray of light to solve this inextricable mystery, and explain how it is, that some of the great men in enlightened Christian America are taxing their intellects and wasting their power to prove that **SLAVERY IS JUSTIFIABLE AND RIGHT!**

Dr. Reese concludes his notice of Mr. Phelps's speech in the following polite strain. "But we forbear to pursue any farther, the folly and extravagance of this newly fledged agent, for the whole speech is a tissue of similar rant, hyperbole and fiction, and is characterised by an excess of bitterness, which carries with it its own refutation. We will only add, that he accuses the civil authorities of the city of New York, with the crime of *piracy*, &c."

There is no "bitterness," no "rant," in the above extract--no slanderous charge--no insinuation--no false imputation--no violation of the well-known meaning of phrases, and no base charges of motives! the whole is a tissue or mass of excellence not "*newly fledged*"--not characterised by "*folly and extravagance*," but just emerged from the mint of perfection! In fact the whole review of Mr. Phelps breathes so much of the spirit of loving kindness, while at the same time it is such a masterly overpowering exhibition of genius, eloquence, and logic, that it must not be passed over without comment. Mr. P. says the reviewer, "reminds us of a fable," &c. "The truth is, the proposition and the logic by which it is sustained, are alike contemptible, and the friends of the society should place their *permanent agency* in better hands." How beautiful! How delightful to hear one Minister of the Gospel use language towards another which hot headed politicians and demagogues would scarcely tolerate!

"The next speech is that of Mr. Thome, of Kentucky, a student of the Lane Seminary, who, but that he is a boy, and may some time or other be a man, and repent of his folly, and calumny, too, we might be led to visit his windy eloquence, with the rebuke it merits," &c. What mercy and compassion! how the Doctor would handle him if he was not a boy! I have heard some such threats before. Indeed it generally happens, that when a man is afraid to fight, he threatens and bullies, and makes a great noise. My opinion is that Mr. Thome's "windy eloquence," is quite as substantial as Dr R's. windy threats and declamations. Much as the Doctor pitied the young man—the boy—he did not fail to exert all his mind and strength, in endeavouring to ridicule and in railing against him. The Doctor says: "The following specimen of the universal licentiousness which he described as existing in the Slave States, will show the hardihood and audacity of this juvenile but experienced observer."

Then follows the specimen: "Pollution, pollution! *Young men of talents and respectability; fathers, professors of religion—ministers—all classes!* overwhelming pollution!" I would not have you fail to understand that this is a *general evil!*" upon which the Doctor in his remarks shows his lenity and pity to the boy by saying "such an outrage upon the truth and upon decency as this *infamous libel,*" &c. and these, "and the details uttered by this *calumniator,* are too polluting to bear repetition." (But mind ye if he was not a boy!) Indeed this *brazen young man,* who seemed to glory in his own shame," &c. All this goes to show the Doctor's lenity, towards the "unfortunate and misguided youth."

Next for the kitchen affair—now what a contemptible jugglery is this into which the reviewer falls, what a piece of dirty quibbling! what filthy inuendoes! (he knew it from personal knowledge, and what an experienced young man is this! &c.) Why in the name of decency, does the Doctor drag out the disgusting detail, and dwell upon it with such *gusto?* Really one would think from the Doctor's use of the terms *offensive, disgusting, unblushing,* and the like, that he some time or other had met **POLLUTION** personified, and talked with him.

But after all what does the Doctor prove, or what does he disprove? He says Mr. Thome is a "calumniator," and I suppose he would swear to it—but he can't prove it—and all we have for it is Doctor R's. *ipse dixit.* My object in this criticism is only to notice and remark upon the Doctor's errors and sophistries. Had I leisure, and did my limits permit, I would be happy to convince every unsophisticated reader, that Mr. Thome, has said nothing inconsistent with truth and righteousness. Although the sticklers for false expediency may say he was rash, truth, like a

two edged sword will vindicate his doctrines, and bring him off triumphant at last.—The Doctor says but little of the Rev. Beriah Green, although as usual he gives him a dose, not of *stereotyped malignity*, nor of *gall* which cannot be *sweetened*, but of (as I suppose he would call it) Christian forbearance. As however, President Green is a very inconsiderable man, and altogether beneath Dr. Reese's notice; he very soon passes on and lets him alone, thinking, I *suppose*, that to be the *best way*. If it was not for the vulgarity of the thing, I would introduce a fable in this place, to show that the Doctor acted very considerably and very prudently in thus passing on. What a beautiful neat little comment the Doctor makes upon the Rev. Mr. Ludlow! How he expands the bare remark of Mr. L., that "the meeting was the funeral of Colonization!" The reviewer rounds off a period well! The funeral has made him pathetic! The Rev. Dr. Cox next comes in for a share. After remarking very prettily at some length, the reviewer says "what kind of colored men he referred to, he did not explain, and we cannot hope to do him justice without an explanation of "*terms as he uses them.*" This makes every thing come *nice*! combining the dear insinuations with the lucid argumentation, we have here a most thrilling compound. The reviewer thus remarks of Wm. L. Garrison and Charles Stewart; "both of them are dipped in gall, and neither can be sweetened." What a climax of beauty! the very quintessence of love! What follows from the Doctor in regard to these men is almost as good, but he "leaves" them to pour out his very soul and bowels of compassion upon the "rant" and extravagance advocated by the Rev. S. S. Jocelyn.

But the "alarming and treasonable sentiments advocated and enforced" by the Rev. Mr. May, claims the Doctor's attention. His charges against Mr. May are all answered in principle, in the remarks which I made vindicating the Anti-Slavery Society from the charge of violating the constitution, &c. I have only two things to remark in relation to the quotation from Mr. May and the Doctor's remarks upon them:—first, while every candid man and Christian must admit the force and truth of Mr. May's sentiment—every scholar will admit the eloquence of his style, and the independence of his character. Secondly, Dr. Reese's remarks upon his sentiments, appear in contrast like mud thrown against a stately edifice, which, instead of destroying only tarnishes, for a moment—time will purge away the foul stain.

The Doctor next takes hold of the Rev. Mr. Pomeroy, having demolished, as he seems to think, Mr. May; and truly Mr. May would be demolished if the noise and breath of seeming hatred or opprobrium could do it. I say then, the Doctor next attacks the Rev. Mr. Pomeroy. By the way, *en passant*, to see the Doctor pass from one to the other, with such rapidity and do such tremen-

dous execution, is truly admirable! What immortal honours will crown the hero's head? What laurels will future ages entwine for the brow of the champion? Had he lived in the age of chivalry, the Knight of La Mancha had never been known as the redoubtable or the *invincible*, and Dulcinea Del Toboso might have perished in the den of a giant.

Dr. Reese, after repeating the old strain, of "highly inflammatory, &c.," speaks of Mr. Pomeroy as ranking slave-holders and apologists with the murderer, &c. This I have before, in principle, treated of. Next he takes great offence at what he thinks fiendish, viz.—Mr. Pomeroy glories in the disturbances at the south, which are made by disturbing the slave-holders, with truth. One would think Dr. Reese had generosity enough of sentiment not to misrepresent a man's meaning. This habit of suppressing and misrepresenting, I must repeat it, is little, and low, and mean, and base. Dr. Reese knows that Mr. P. glories in the fact, that the truth was reaching the south, and making slave-holders feel its influence, and not in any disturbances, as the "insurrection and massacre of Southampton;" and Dr. Reese ought to know, that what he says of Mr. Pomeroy, "can it be uch to any but a fiend?" is virtually slandering that gentleman, and he ought to be ashamed of it. What Dr. Reese says, in reply to Mr. Pomeroy's "description of the helpless condition of the slaves," is as loose and wild as possible. In one sense it may be true, and if true, does not effect Mr. Pomeroy at all. If Dr. Reese had been as definite as he should be, (and as I believe, Mr. Pomeroy was) and specified in which of the Southern States, or in what part of them, Christian and Sabbath privileges are extended to the slaves, and then shown that these places were the places referred to by Mr. Pomeroy, there would be some force in his remarks: but as it is, reader, what do you think? Do you say force, or froth? Here follows something, however, from the Doctor, which is not froth altogether. "But as a specimen of the outrageous recklessness of truth, by which this Minister is signalized, and it is only one of many"—(*e pluribus unum*)—"this is palpably false, &c." How mannerly? and it was'nt false at all—and in another place:—"he has basely slandered the system and laws of his country." Is Dr. Reese serving either God or his country by such "*bitter*" charges against a brother Clergyman? and when Dr. Reese "*knows*" that "*bad as*" it is for a man to do evil, it is nevertheless base to charge a man with doing evil, if he has not done it, or if you have no evidence of it. What doth it signify to fret or foam—to call Mr. Pomeroy's statements "*false*," charge him with calumny and the like, unless it be to prove the assertions and the charge and benefit community! Truly writers of the present day run mad. One takes up a pamphlet on a contested subject, and the most that he sees is:—"Mr. A. states so and

so; and Mr. A. is a liar. Mr. B. remarks, &c., &c., he is guilty of an *outrageous recklessness of truth*? Mr. C. says &c., and Mr. C. exhibits nothing but the ravings of a *mad man*. Mr. D. affirms, &c. But this man, though a *professed Christian Minister*, insults *heaven and earth* by affirming" so and so---and all these ministers of the Gospel! I wonder what the enemies of religion must say, when they read the pleasantries, and witticisms, and slanders of Christian Ministers exercised against their ministerial brethren? Infidels and devils may laugh! but I have no doubt that angels weep, if angels can sympathize with mortals.

The reviewer next *uses up* Mr. Staunton. For a genuine specimen of fallacy in reasoning, I wish the reader to notice the Doctor's *quibbling* upon the *term public sentiment*. The public sentiment which is now against us, the people of colour, is *vincible*, and yet we are all the while *borne along* by it! This seems strange, a perfect contradiction to the mind of the Doctor. "Colonization Society wields public sentiment;" and yet this public sentiment *vincible*! Impossible the Doctor thinks! a perfect contradiction! Well, I have only to ask the Doctor, "does the public sentiment ever change? does it ever take an exactly opposite stand? If so, beware, Doctor, of your position---beware of your sneers, and do not act the maniac, by laughing at others when you deserve, I had almost said, the strait jacket yourself!

"This speech (see page 34) however was sustained in its dark characteristics by a black man, who seconded it, and he falsely charged the Colonization Society with *producing enactments against coloured schools*, and sustaining legislative provisions for thrusting the coloured people out of their native land." As the Doctor here alludes to myself, I trust I may be permitted to make my defence, and that my readers will bear with me patiently. I am ready to answer him:---as the saying is, "*to measure swords with him*." I want the Doctor to understand that I don't mean swords *literally*---because he can construe the most obvious meaning to suit his purposes, and proceed, not from

"Grave to gay---*from* lively to severe,"

but from figurative to literal, and *vice versa*.

In regard to the charge alluded to by Dr. Reese, it would appear strange that I should charge the Colonization Society with "*legislative enactments*." I am not so ignorant but I may know that the legislatures produce their own enactments. If I said that the Colonization Society produced these enactments, the meaning is, that these enactments are the result of influences produced by the Colonization Society, or at least by that class of citizens which sustain the Colonization Society. I wish it to be understood that it is the *principle of Colonization* that is adverse to *coloured schools*, and our improvement here; it is the *idea* of transporting us beyond the seas "*to Africa or elsewhere*," that operates

like an *incubus* upon the philanthropy, and generosity, and love, which would otherwise further our advancement in every department, and emancipate the slaves; it is in *reality* the *Colonization Society*; acting like a false light, to direct the mind of the benevolent and humane away from our sufferings, and from the sufferings of our poor enslaved brethren. The *Colonization Society* is, in reality, to every coloured American, 'a moral *Upas tree*, beneath whose pestiferous shades all intellect must languish and all virtue die.' Now whether Colonizationists see, or can contemplate these things or not, or take them into their calculations, *it is the Colonization Society* that produces enactments hostile to coloured schools, and to our elevation in any other way, in "*this, our own, our native land.*"

I wonder now if the Doctor can understand what I mean? *viz.* ---the tendency of the Colonization Society is, to produce enactments detrimental to the vital interests of the people of colour in these United States, and these tendencies have produced their results, so far as they have been developed.

The rest of what he says against me is so far beneath a gentleman---"black" or "white"---that I cannot here descend to a level with him. I confess that *here* I do not wish myself nor my race to be upon an *equality* with Dr. Reese. If I cannot speak of any individual of the human family, without charging every word with opprobrium, and gall, and wormwood, I hope I shall always possess good breeding and politeness enough to be silent. "And perhaps this poor coloured man is not so much to blame as those who told him what to say."\* Perhaps not! and perhaps a coloured man may live for years in the radiation of such luminous bodies as Dr. Reese, and not understand such a scrap of Latin as *secundum artem*. Alas, that the classical learning of Mr. T. C. Brown should expose him to such a *torrent of ridicule*! Well! perhaps, the *poor coloured man* can say a word for himself without being told "what to say." As for the insinuation of ignorance and impudence *too*, which the Doctor's sneer contains, I have nothing to say; I cannot, as I before said, meet the Doctor on such *low grounds*; but the insinuation or charge of being "told what to say," I am compelled to declare is altogether false. I spoke at the time upon the spur of the moment---I rejoiced to see so many good and great men stand up as the advocates of oppressed innocence---of bleeding humanity---and I could not conceal the feelings of my heart.

\* That it is a principle of colonization, first to *stab*, and then prescribe a fatal remedy for the wound, I have ever known; but for such a man as the Right Rev. Bishop David M. Reese, M. D. would be, to be guilty of such an *apish* trick, in this late day, as to insinuate, on account of the color of my skin, that I was acting the *ape*, is something new, and surely more degrading to himself than cruel to me, for none but *APES* will doubt for a moment but what man is *man* every where.

I cannot here forbear remarking upon the opinions which many persons entertain of the intellects of the people of color. That we are as a people degraded and ignorant, I freely acknowledge ; (that there are individual exceptions all ought to know)—but that there is any thing in our anatomical or physical organization to warrant the *charge*, that we are but little above the brutes, and totally, or nearly so, incapable of refinement, literary attainment, or acquisition in knowledge of any kind, is an insult so glaring against the God who made of *one blood* all nations, and such an outrage upon the experience of the colored people when opportunity afforded, that it is very strange indeed, that any man can be found so foolish, apish and wicked as to prefer it. I do not say that such is the opinion of Dr. R., but really it looks like it, when he makes such groundless charges against me. The Dr. ought to know that these *Schools founded for us* in the several States of *Maine Mass., R. Island Conn., New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania*, by the *Manumission Societies*, for which we the colored people desire to be grateful, as I trust we are, have produced their legitimate effects, and among the scholars who are so much *despised for wearing a sable skin*, may be found those who are not only able to speak without being “told what to say,” but who are able to compete with even Doctor Reese himself, in science, literature, and especially in sound logic.

The Reviewer now comes to the address of the Rev. Dr. Cox. The only thing which he attempts, is to fasten upon Dr. C. the charge of encouraging intermarriages ; with how much success, and how much of a christian spirit, I leave his readers to judge. I was shocked to read the details of his rant and impoliteness. Truly the man that seems so much to abhor *stale rant* ought not to be such a scavenger general and pander universal of the vile and odious commodity. Does Dr. Cox advocate intermarriages ? Who dare say it ? None but he who can make a false inference and arrogantly impute to another, mean and base motives. Dr. Cox declares that “intermarriages have nothing to do with the question of prejudice ;” and can we not exercise the duty of Christians toward our brethren without intermarriages, and will not Dr. C. be believed when he says so ? Oh no ! according to the Reviewer he must come out and forswear himself—call heaven and earth to witness that he will, and now does puke and *purge* himself clear of the “*enormity*” both now and forever, *Amen*. He must come out and say not only (as indeed he did say) that we desire no *intermarriages*, it is not our aim and has nothing to do with our efforts : but he must declare that intermarriages is an “*enormity*”!

We the people of color understand the sentiments in this particular, of that great and good and persecuted man, and believe that he does “repudiate the sentiment” alluded to, while at the same time we believe that he is *too much* a christian to treat the people of color with seeming contempt by uttering the expression. The



religion of Jesus Christ teaches courtesy to all, "*without distinction of color*," and this his eminent disciple is willing to follow the precepts and example of his divine master, whether they subject him to the scoffs of a frowning world or not. I wish that his calumniators, Dr. Reese and all, possessed the same mind in this respect, and that each one of them had an "independedent set of principles," principles founded upon the word of God, to act upon. If such were the case, it would save much slanderous vituperous breath, and supercede the necessity of "*extinguishers*." The reviewer goes on in a strain of billingsgate, (I would not use the expression if I could help it—I hate to say any thing of this kind, but I dont swell into an inflammation! If I should call the devil an angel I would lie,) and talks of Dr. C's. "old morbid theory" and "his plan for elevating the people of color at the *hymeneal altar*," and then he italicises *expediency* like the maniac who will cry out that his friend is mad, who is taking him to bedlam. Then he hunts up an old story, and tells about a *friend of ours*—I suppose about a *joint editor*;\* and like a good noble minded considerate philanthropist and friend, he expatiates on the Doctor's "*arrogant declamation*" and his "egotism"—"beyond remedy;" and then he speaks of "morbid paroxysms" and "lucid intervals" in a style that would almost make one think he himself was laboring under the very malady figured out. But he concludes! (yes every flurry ceases!) "We shall therefore close our notice of this pamphlet without any further reference to this misguided and erring brother, since he already occupies so unenviable a position before the public eye as almost to disarm criticism." So I suppose again that the reviewer after expending all his shafts (if they can be called shafts that dont cut, but only a little bruise) and *doing his best*, says that the Doctor's condition "disarms criticism." Yes, the Dr. is prostrated in the eye of public sentiment, and what a magnanimous act it was for Dr. Reese to level his old fusce at a fallen enemy! His conduct in this particular is so much like the story of the animal which kicked the dead lion, that I am persuaded Dr. R. took the hint from the example of his long cared brother. In review

The public may not be aware, that, the Commercial, a daily paper in this city under the supervision of Colonel Stone, receives (according to report and I have no doubt of it) no small share of its editorial support, from the pen of the Right reverend bishop divine doctor Reese. I wish the public to be acquainted with this fact. It is a fact of some importance in our dissection of the learned prelate's "*review*," as it is the paper that proclaimed and forstalled the "*review*"—the paper that pronounced it, an "*extinguisher*" ere it came forth from its original nothing—the paper that has puffd it ever since it made its appearance—the paper that has been a long time puffing Bishop Reese, and using all its pneumatical enginery to *puff*! him up into *notoriety*. What is the implication? Why, either that Dr. Reese wrote all these *puffs* himself, or that he must be a mighty dear bosom friend and brother of Col. Stone. I dont know that Dr. Reese has any interest in that paper, perhaps he gives his services, for the honor—"is *working his passage*" into fame, and will ere long approve his gratitude to the Editor, while at present his motto is—"Col. you tickle my back, and I'll tickle your belly."

of the Doctor's criticism of the "speeches delivered at the late anniversary meetings," I have one or more remarks to make.—First, the Dr. appears to write as though he considered himself the greatest man in the universe—marching along like Atlas with the Heavens upon his shoulder. He asks the astounded world to do him homage—

"Shakes his ambrosial curls, assumes the god,  
And seems to shake the spheres."

He pities and despises such men as Rev. Messrs. May, Phelps and Pomery, and holds Prest. Green and Dr. Cox in utter contempt.—But secondly, it cannot be concealed throughout the whole, that the Dr. feels a rankling spirit of envy, a kind of rivalry which knows its futility, and says to these men, "If I only had your talents, if I only was popular, if I was only as *notorious* in the world as either of you, Colonization might go to Africa, and joy go with it; I would then as soon be an abolitionist as any thing else!" But perhaps the Dr. might be afraid of the popular fury if he were an abolitionist. But then he could come out in the papers and deny the charge.—He knows how he did before in respect to a certain Report.

After leaving Dr. Cox utterly and totally *extinguished* and defunct, the reviewer goes on to give a description of the Anniversary meetings of the Anti-Slavery Society in the Chatham-street Chapel, in the true spirit of romance. And "let it be remembered." Hear it, O heavens, and be astonished, O earth! Ye beasts of the forest shriek! *This meeting was held during the ANNIVERSARY WEEK!* Horrid! And this Anti-Slavery Anniversary was held in the same place with the other Anniversaries! Doubly horrible! And then it was held on TUESDAY! Too bad to be endured! But how shall I describe the enormity that follows? "When the house began to fill up, it was obvious that very many colored persons, forsaking the places assigned to them in the house on all other occasions, began to seat themselves promiscuously throughout the Chapel!" &c. The black devils! How durst they be so impudent? And did the wretches indeed seat themselves promiscuously? "*How long will an insulted community bear this?*" (Mr. Webb.) Up! ye avengers of this violation of public sentiment! disabuse public opinion! Purge with fire! demolish with clubs, and stones, and brick bats! sack and pillage? tar and feather! Ye guardians of the public peace, retire to the turbulent dominions of Anarchy, and let wild disorder, riot and mob prevail!

"*The cruel prejudice of caste,*" as it is called, existing as it does in the lowest classes of our white population to a greater extent than any where else, might naturally be expected to operate upon the wicked and depraved by exciting the worst passions and prompting to deeds of violence." Yes, we knew these base characters would be excited; and to make sure work of it, we, who had more influence in the world, took order to excite their passions by telling them that

abolitionists must not be tolerated! Such an outrage upon community as the mixture at the Anniversary meetings induced the "public presses" nearly all of them to "discountenance, condemn, and even ridicule them." "But again and again, in disregard of the private advice of the judicious, and the public rebuke of every day's newspaper in the city"—Horrible! the same disgusting farce was acted over every night; and dining parties for *whites* and *black* promiscuously had been given! Oh! blind consummation of madness! Yes, and in several churches colored persons had been introduced into the pews with WHITE PEOPLE, nolens volens!!

It is a wonder that the seats had not sunk under them, and buried them *promiscuously* in a promiscuous heap of ruins! I wonder if when they come to the judgment seat to hear their doom, if they would stand or sit *promiscuously*, and if they were all so happy as to receive a blissful portion in *seats* of happiness, I wonder if the seats would be *promiscuous*!

But "then came the fourth of July celebration"; and oh! what a *desecration*! Shades of '76! "The Declaration of Independence was read," and in proximity to it, that "insignificant and treasonable production—the *Declaration* of the Anti-Slavery Convention!" Oh! what "a political SIN to name these Declarations *in the same day*, and especially to connect them together in the hallowed services of our country's Sabbath!" Methinks I see the ghosts of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, start up, up, like the witches in Macbeth, and dance a jig of horror over the desecrated ruins of their country! and while they dance and utter a horrid dirge of wo, I hear the father of his country, in plaintive language, most piteously complain: "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence" I long ago forewarned you, but to my salutary advice ye turned a deaf ear; and now behold, Charles Stewart and George Thompson have accomplished your ruin! Oh! my bleeding, bleeding country! The honor of my country! fallen—fallen! Yonder insignificant, treasonable production, entitled Declaration of the A. A. S. Convention, "coming in *proximity* to the glorious Declaration of our Independence," is a stain upon our escutcheon that neither humanity nor religion can wash away! Farewell, boasted America! Child of my affections, FAREWELL! thy doom is SEALED!

The Dr's remarks upon the Dec. of the A. S. Convention, is a mere repetition of what occurs previously. It is answered. I will not spend a moment in repetition, nor waste my time in noticing his *egotism* and self complacency in having, as he "humbly conceives," *extinguished* the A. S. Society. I proceed to his "important conclusions." These conclusions are ten in number, I suppose the Dr's colonization decalogue, and in my opinion rather the grounds which he assumed—from which he started, than the conclusions to which he arrived. As I have completely refuted the arguments, or rather the assumption upon which he predicates these conclusions, or more

logically from which he draws them, they will claim my further notice no more than merely to say of them *en masse*, that they are conclusions about as legitimate as the following would be, viz : Lewis XVI. was King of France,—George III. was King of England,—Therefore, George Washington was President of the United States. The critic or attentive reader will perceive that the Dr. is all the while striking at one thing, and having his eye at the same time upon another. For instance, he makes a desperate *lounge* at *equality*, and our elevation, when at the same time *amalgamation*, like the phantom of classic story, engages his attention and leads him away from his enemy, or leaves him to be conquered. He sees *amalgamation* in every effort that the Anti-Slavery Society has made. If he essays to speak of prejudice, why *amalgamation*\* stares him in the

\*The Dr.'s and other colonizationists mode of making a scare crow of the term amalgamation, reminds me of an anecdote which (by the way as the Dr. may profit by it) I will relate. During my tour last autumn through the beautiful western country, I visited the enterprising city of Pittsburgh. While there, several Anti-Slavery meetings were held, and the Pittsburgh A. S. Society was established, which in some degree arrested the public attention. When I took my departure for the North, it was between the hours of 12 and 1 o'clock at night. The number of passengers which occupied the stage were six, viz. two ladies, two gentlemen, a two-legged animal and myself. The night being thick with Egyptian darkness, it was impossible for one to discover the other's complexion. Making our way across the beautiful Allegany, the subject of slavery came up; they all declared themselves opposed to slavery, but could not exactly agree upon a plan of removing it. The ladies had supported colonization as a remedy; one gentleman was on the fence respecting colonization; the other had nothing to do with colonization or abolition, he had never examined either scheme. The animal was a vociferous colonizationist, and he poured forth the old worn out vituperations upon the abolitionists in no sparing degree.—“Madmen! fanatics! disorganizers! amalgamaters!” &c. were among the modest terms from the colonizationist's vocabulary. The last, “amalgamation,” was his hobby. He appealed to us to know if we “could in any manner countenance the scheme of abolitionists, when they advocated amalgamation by intermarriages between the whites and blacks?” “No one believed that amalgamation had any thing to do with the question,” said I—“amalgamation has nothing to do with the question; but if I could gain the hand and heart of a colored lady, I would consider myself honored to accompany her to the Hymeneal altar.” Said he, “you would! would you marry a black?” “I would marry a colored lady in preference to a white one.” “But are you a single gentleman?” “Yes.” “Heavens! marry a black! marry a negress! Now gentlemen you see—but, are you an abolitionist, sir?” “Yes, sir.” “Yes, and you would marry a negress in preference to a white lady! Now gentlemen—now ladies, are either of you prepared to give yourself up to a black man?” “I am not prepared to give myself up to any man.” “But excuse me, would you be an abolitionist and marry a negro?” “Why I don't think that marrying has any thing to do with the question, sir. The question is not whether you will marry a colored man or woman; it is whether you will suffer them to be free?” “Well, to be candid, I did not in reality believe it was a question of amalgamation by intermarrying, but when I discuss the question, I have used the term amalgamation as a scare crow, because it seems to be the only thing that will reach the prejudices of the public, and prevent them from falling in with their measures. As much as I have harped upon amalgamation, I never could believe that so many good people would engage in advocating such a doctrine until now, this person [meaning me] avows himself an abolitionist and an amalgamator. Now I'll be cursed if abolition don't

face? He regards prejudice as the key stone in the noble arch of American Colonization. I say my dear brother, the Rev. Bishop David M. Reese, M. D. regards it such, and well he knows if this were removed, that magnificent structure would fall in ruins, and therefore his conclusion is—to oppose prejudice is amalgamation! And throughout the whole review it is this horror of amalgamation that has frozen up all my brother's charity, all his politeness, all his logic.

"Monstrum horrendum informe ingens."

The reader will please to look at the reviewer's 8th conclusion, where he seems to admit the *possibility* that something *might* be done by the free States to aid the South in breaking the yoke of slavery, if only the *right kind of men* were engaged in the work. But this is only a supposition that any "*moral efforts*" here can effect the cause of abolition in the Southern States—not a supposition hardly, but "on the supposition," &c. "Moral efforts"! But then can moral efforts be admitted? Why these efforts will (see conclusion 4th) inevitably tend to "disaffect the independent sovereignties," &c. Therefore, (conclusion 6th) these moral efforts are to be deprecated as a public calamity. Every thing then must be done by the South, and (read the whole of conclusion 9th) must be "consistent with the public sentiment of the South." Suffer me here to make one remark, or ask a question, If the South must do the work alone, when will the work be done consistent with public sentiment? when, in the name of possibility, can it be done, unless a change is made in public sentiment? Here is a real *choker* again. Now, my dear "brother," your *extinguisher* won't work here! What is the public sentiment of the South now, slavery or abolition? Which of these two is consistent with the public sentiment of the South? Manifestly slavery. Well then, slavery must continue, *because* it is consistent with the *public sentiment*.

mean amalgamation. Poh! marrying has nothing to do with it, after all, it is a mere matter of taste whether one marries a *white* or a *black*. That has always been my candid opinion, but here is evidence to the contrary." "The fact," said I, "of my preferring a colored lady to a white one, has nothing to do with the principle, and you admitted that you thought it a mere matter of taste." "Yes, and devilish bad taste too, to marry a negress, and if it is your taste, God bless you and your wife too, when you get her." "I thank you, sir."—After a calm that lulled us into a short doze, the light from the east began to overtake us, and as soon as I thought my complexion would appear to an advantage, I raised the curtain. The animal screamed out, "Good heavens! a negro! why you are a black man!!" [Every other passenger was ready to burst with laughter.] "Yes, I am a colored man." "Why, heavens! I—I thought you was a white man!" "I was in night's eye." "I'll be d—d if I was ever so disappointed in my life!" Well—well we can't always know all things at all times." "No," said another, "if you had known what you have learned, you would not have exposed yourself." He was so choked that he was not at all communicative until breakfast, when we reached the next inn. He objected to my eating at the breakfast table, and exhibited every thing of the true *pork*, except showing the bristles, which were covered with a fine coat. I offered to retire, but my position being sustained by every lady and gentleman present, I kept my seat; he of course granted, and left the room. After arriving at the next town I bid them adieu. Some days after I arrived at Eric, where I found the animal at home in the pen with the pigs.

But, pshaw! why should I spend time in laying bare these contradictions and absurdities which my intelligent readers will discover as readily as the "poor colored man!" It is true that for sake of the more ignorant part of the community who are liable to be imposed upon by the speeches and sophistry of the Dr. who knows "what to say," I am willing if it were proper to take up the review and sift it line by line, word by word, but my limits will not permit.

Before I bid my dear and reverend brother farewell and wish him a "happy deliverance" from the web of sophistry in which he is entangled, I must notice some corresponding remarks of his rival and co-adjutor Heman Howlett. It is with pleasure that I leave the Doctor's inextricable labyrinths of error and "reason lost" to tread upon the firm statistical grounds of Mr. H. The former leads you along, and ere you are aware, you are ready to curse your folly for following an *ignis fatuus*. But the latter with his eye fixed inflexibly upon the polar star of truth, leads you in no devious path, but true as the needle to the pole, directs you at once to the region of facts and demonstrative argument. In reference to the foreigners now in our country, he very eloquently observes—"Go ye foreign emissaries and view the affairs of oppressed and degraded Ireland, who are represented by the great Dr. Dwight as slaves to their landlords!!" And in regard to the right of holding slaves he makes the following pertinent and very excellent remarks. "If the question were discussed at the adoption of the Constitution, it must have been introduced in this way; the opposers of slavery said, that in our declaration of Independence *we have declared that all men are free and equal*, as possessing certain inalienable rights: among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; but undoubtedly the slave owners replied, the *black* population have ever been considered our private property, and why should we after toiling and suffering several years and spilling our blood,\* to ward off the ruthless hand of oppression and tyranny whereby we gained our freedom, why should *we now* sign a Constitution that the instant we do it, will annihilate one half our property! It follows as a matter of course, they would either hold on to the slaves or become separate governments; it was not practicable at that time to establish two separate governments, for it required all the little energy that they then possessed under the then existing and distracted circumstances of the financial affairs of the country, with an exhausted and reduced army without pay or clothing to support one."

Here is a plain unsophisticated relation of probabilities which carries irresistible conviction to the mind of every reader! and to show that the framers of our Constitution did right in regard to this question he adduces texts of scripture so pointedly that there is no escaping them, no *let up* to them. See his book, page 14. The texts quoted—Rom. xiii. 1, 2.—Titus iii. 1. 5—Peter ii. 6, 13. Dan. ii. 6. 21.

But Mr. H's plan of gradual emancipation is a masterpiece. He shows mathematically, that the slaves in the U. S. can be colonized.

Expences ONLY \$758,322,500,00 !

Annual expence \$23,697,571,87 !!

Interest on annual expence, at 7 per cent. \$1,658,830 00 !!

For particulars see the pamphlet. Here now is a plan, plausible, feasible—all *cut and dried* to your hand which the author has planned, devised, concocted, hatched out—immortal honor to his name—and now ready for your inspection and use, Oh philanthropists of America ! and after paying all this amount specified by Heman, will leave in the treasury no less than “\$737,689,147 20 !” Now say that Colonization is impracticable !! In short the whole work of Heman Howlett is transcendant and superlative. I defy all the abolitionists in Christendom, if they were so disposed, to produce a burlesque upon the scheme of the American Col. Society, that will at all equal this admirable production ; and if the author, Mr. H. had turned it to that account, he might have realized an independent fortune from it.

My dear brother, Rev. Bishop Reese, M. D. closes his famous exegesis by submitting his conclusions to the citizens and christians of America, pretty sure that no “sophistry can evade them.” I now submit my criticism to the same candid public, entirely regardless whether *sophistry* evade them or not, but challenging the truth to search them. If there be any thing of importance in the review which I have not noticed, it was not because the thing itself was impregnable, nor because I was not equal to the seige, but, as I stated before, because my limits did not permit a comment upon every error in my brother’s deviating course. But as it is, I submit it to the candor of a generous public, and should *public sentiment* condemn the work, should it be thought out of place and *inexpedient* by any of my friends—should it gain for me frowns and reproaches instead of laurels—one thing I know, posterity will requite my wrongs, and when the “extinguisher” of Dr. David M. Reese shall itself have been extinguished in death, and sunk down—down—in the long eternal sleep of oblivion. my little book, pregnant with truth, shall survive the revolution of ages, and give even Dr. Reese himself a reluctant IMMORTALITY !

### ERRATA.

Page 3, line 20, read “I will *sometimes* merely,” &c.

6, “ 9, for “this,” read “thus.”

10, “ 3d from bottom, for “of,” read “from.”

14, “ 7, read repugnance *perhaps* from, &c.

“ “ 16, for “we did skate,” read “we skated.”

19, “ 17, suppress “&c.” before Missionaries.

20, “ 33, for “Great Good,” read “Great and Good.”

23, “ 30, for “printed,” read “hinted.”

24, “ 2, read “was *not* openly,” &c.

28, “ 15, for “purity,” read “party.”

“ “ 13, “rambled *through* her, &c.